Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-113
Monday
13 June 1988

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-113 *13 June 1988*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Briefing on Cruise Missile Removal From UK 1
Missiles To Be Destroyed in 'a Few Days' 1

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Communist Leaders Briefed on Summit *[PRAVDA 9 Jun]* 2
Pact Defense Ministers Visit Exercise Area *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Jun]* 2
Conference Held on Fighting Drug Addiction 2

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Shevardnadze Meets Press, Departs New York 4
Embassy Press Statement 4
Comments on Afghan Withdrawal 5
Departs for Moscow 10 Jun 6
Moscow Arrival Reported 6
Further Reportage on UN Disarmament Session 6
Joint Statement Circulated 6
Proposals Cited 7
Ukrainian Addresses Session 7
Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' 7
East-West Security Conference Ends in Potsdam 12
GDR's Fischer Speaks 12
Aboymov Remarks Cited 12
Chervov on Arms Reduction *[DPA]* 13
Kapitsa Addresses Mongolian Asia-Pacific Meeting 13

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Deploying SDI Means 'Grave Destabilization' *[Solton]* 15
Reagan Urges Congress To Work on New Trade Bill 15
Reagan Sends Special Message to Senate on INF 15
Shultz 'Disappointed' by Mideast Plan Reactions 16
Dobrynin Receives AP President Boccardi 16
Murakhovskiy Receives President of U.S. Company 16
RSFSR Delegation Ends Visit to Illinois 17
Further on Soviet Workers Denied U.S. Visas *[TRUD 2 Jun]* 17
U.S. Paper Views CIA Involvement in Irangate 17
'International Diary' Views Moscow Summit *[Pravdin, Kornilov]* 18
'Studio 9' Television Program on Moscow Summit *[Zorin, Bessmertnykh, Falin]* 20

China

Joint Economic Committee Meets in Beijing *[Ivanov]* 28
Maslyukov on 'Positive' Changes 28
Delegation Returns From PRC *[PRAVDA 10 Jun]* 28
Beijing Confirms Deng Xiaoping Position Unchanged 29
PRC Cooperation in Nuclear Disarmament Urged *[Alekseyev]* 29
Comparison of Rogachev Beijing News Conference *[IZVESTIYA 9 Jun]* 29

Northeast Asia

Liner Fire Caused by Passenger Safety Violation 30
Gorbachev Meets With Japanese Labor Delegates 30
Commentary Views Summit, UN Disarmament Session *[Dmitriyev]* 30
Japanese Friendship Association Founding Marked 31
Seoul Summer Olympics Security Plan Viewed *[Vladimirov in PRAVDA 6 Jun]* 32
DPRK Foreign Minister Makes Moscow Stopover *[PRAVDA 4 Jun]* 32
DPRK Government Posts Reshuffled 3 Jun *[PRAVDA 4 Jun]* 32

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Gorbachev Envoy Meets With Leaders on Summit 33
Received by Cambodia's Heng Samrin 33
Meets Lao Leaders 33
Western 'Interference' Criticized by Burma *[Vladimirov]* 33

Near East & South Asia

Further Reportage on Afghan Accord 'Violations' 34
Pogodin Accuses Pakistan 34
More Protests to UN 34
Soviet Observance Noted 35
Foreign Ministry Statement 35
Soviet Reinforcements Reported in Afghanistan *[Beijing XINHUA]* 36
Najibullah Ends Cuba Visit, Arrives in Moscow 36
Warns on Soviet Withdrawal 36
Met by Shevardnadze 12 Jun 37
Departs Moscow 13 Jun 37
Pakistani Ambassador Summoned Over POW's 38
India, Syrian Leaders Cited on Afghanistan 38
Afghan 'Extremists' Liquidated by Armed Forces 38
Afghan 'Terrorist Groups' Routed in 2 Provinces 38
Algiers Pan-Arab Summit Results Summarized 39
'Serious Blow' to U.S. *[Pogodin]* 39
Summit Resolution Noted 39
'Arafat Condemns Shultz Plan 39
Glukhov Views Shultz Mideast Trip, Prospects *[PRAVDA 7 Jun]* 40
Envoy to Jordan on Soviet, U.S. Mideast Stances *[Amman AL-DUSTUR 8 Jun]* 40
Consular Pact With Algeria Initialed 41
Dobrynin Receives Bangladesh CP Delegation 41

Sub-Saharan Africa

African Groups Pin Hopes on Moscow Summit *[Dolgov]* 42
TASS, Nigeria Sign News Service Agreement 42
Diplomatic Relations With Benin Reviewed 43
Situation in Horn of Africa Discussed 43
Radio Program Comments on Somali Unrest 44
Petrovskiy, Tanzania's Nyerere Meet in New York 44
U.S. Role in Angolan Fighting Claimed *[Grigoryev]* 44
Grigoryev Views Mozambique Land Reform 45
Briefs 45
USSR-PDRE Hydrogeology Pact 45

East Europe

Whitehead Briefs GDR's Honecker on Summit 46
Belousov, Poland's Messner Meet at Poznan Fair 46
Bulgarian Delegation Stops Off in Tbilisi *[Sofia BTA]* 46

West Europe

Vatican Secretary of State Arrives in Moscow 46
Gorbachev Meets Casaroli *[AFP]* 47
Finnish Defense Minister Continues Visit 47
Yazov Sees Off Norrback 47
Demichev Receives Finnish Envoy's Credentials 47
Official Briefs Finnish President on Summit 47
UK Minister Sees Increasing Cultural Ties 47
Soviet Government Greets Danish Premier 48
Academician on Elimination of Berlin Wall *[Bonn DIE WELT 9 Jun]* 48

Latin America & Caribbean

Gromyko Receives Peruvian Parliamentarians *[PRAVDA 9 Jun]* 48
Delegation Ends Visit 50
Talks 'Very Constructive' 50
Afghan President Visits Cuba, Meets With Castro 50
Najibullah Receives Award 51
Official Discusses Cooperation With Cuba 51
Special Envoy Briefs Ortega on Summit Results 52
Lomeyko Briefs Brazilian Officials on Summit 52

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

More Unrest Reported in Azerbaijan 11 Jun 53
Dissident Cited *[DPA]* 53
Tanks Move Into Baku *[AFP]* 53
Anti-Gorbachev Slogans Shouted *[DPA]* 54
Meetings Discuss Events *[Yerevan]* 54
Armenians Call 3-Day Strike *[AFP]* 54
General Strike in Yerevan *[AFP]* 54
Grigoryants on Yerevan Strike *[DPA]* 55
Armenian Supreme Soviet To Discuss Karabakh *[Yerevan]* 55
Azerbaijan Bureau Adopts Decision on 'Situation' *[Baku]* 55
Armenian, Azerbaijani Officials Discuss Measures *[Baku]* 56
Azerbaijan Party Chief Meets Writers, Artists *[Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 26 May]* 56
Azerbaijan, Armenian Officials Interviewed *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 10 Jun]* 57
Yerevan Radio Interviews Protesters on 'Pogrom' 59
More on Work of Armenian Relocation Commission *[Yerevan]* 61
Armenians Given Temporary Housing *[Yerevan]* 61
Dam Collapse, Flood Reported in Azerbaijan 61
Explosions at Saransk Factory Reported 61
Democratic Union Member Jailed for 7 Days *[AFP]* 62
Police Chief Views 'Informal' Group Protests 62
Yaroslavl Rally Airs Citizens' Grievances *[IZVESTIYA 10 Jun]* 62
Georgian Plenum Proceedings Criticized *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 9 Jun]* 63
Delegate Interviewed on Upcoming Conference 65
Grodno Obkom Chief Kletskov Interviewed *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 20]* 65
Reader on Points Arising From Theses *[PRAVDA 3 Jun]* 68
Zaslavskaya Views Social Changes, Elections 68
Russian Orthodox Church Assembly Ends 69
Statement Urges Peace 69
Justice Minister Addresses Supreme Soviet *[IZVESTIYA 29 May]* 70
Scholar Urges Reform in Legal Sphere *[IZVESTIYA 1 Jun]* 71

Colonel Views Uneasy Militia-Media Relationship *[PRAVDA 29 May]* 74
Official Cited on Emigration, Immigration *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 22]* 76
Moscow City Trade Union Council Holds Session 80
PRAVDA Readers Ponder Party Democracy *[7 Jun]* 80
History Exam Cancellation Causes, Implications *[IZVESTIYA 10 Jun]* 82

Agricultural

Nikonov Visit to Kurgan Oblast Reported 83
Comparison of Nikonov in Yaroslavl *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 22 May]* 84
Goskomstat Reports on Sowing, Harvesting 84
Agricultural Developments for 6-10 Jun Noted 84

Scientific

Officials Resign From Academy in 'Cadre Renewal' 84
'Cosmos-1952' Satellite Launched 11 Jun 85
Space Station Launchings, Experiments Announced 85
'Soyuz' Cosmonauts Join 'Mir' Colleagues 9 Jun 85
Gorbachev, Zhivkov Message *[PRAVDA 10 Jun]* 85
'Intensive' Research Program 86
Flight Progress Described 86
Complaints About Equipment 86
Program Success Cited 87
Sleep Experiment Noted 87
Crew's Fourth Day Reported 87

Briefing on Cruise Missile Removal From UK
LD0806205088 Moscow TASS in English 2049 GMT 9 Jun 88

[Text] Greenham Common June 8 TASS—TASS correspondent Igor Peskov reports:

Spokesmen for the command of the U.S. troops in Britain gave a news conference for local and foreign journalists here today at the Air Force base where U.S. surface-to-surface cruise missiles are deployed. The pressmen were informed of the forthcoming removal of the cruise missiles from Britain and of a procedure to verify it.

It was announced at the news conference that Soviet experts would be able to inspect for 60 days from the beginning of July this year the missile systems subject to elimination, the places of their storing and repair at Greenham Common and Molesworth.

Colonel Bill Jones, commander of the 501st Tactical Missile Wing of the U.S. Air Force, said his unit has at its disposal 101 cruise missiles at Greenham Common and 18 ones at Molesworth. They all will be taken away to the United States where they are subject to elimination. Jones pointed out that neither missiles nor warheads were removed from the U.S. bases so far. Specific timeframe for their dismantling would be determined at the forthcoming consultations within the framework of NATO. The last American missile would be removed from Britain exactly by the time specified by the Soviet-U.S. treaty. Until that time the remaining missiles would remain operational.

At the close of the news conference the journalists were given an opportunity to tour the areas of the base subject to inspection by Soviet experts, the cruise missiles, and launchers.

We are already prepared for the arrival of Soviet experts and we are going to welcome them hospitably and to show them everything that is provided for by the agreement, Bill Jones said in an interview with the TASS correspondent. I personally regard the INF Treaty as a big success. We have finally approached a time when mutual reduction in nuclear arsenals has become possible, and there appeared prospects for further steps in the field of disarmament.

Missiles To Be Destroyed in 'a Few Days'
LD1006121088 Moscow TASS in English 1152 GMT 10 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 10 TASS—By TASS diplomatic correspondent:

A few days remain before the first batches of nuclear medium- and shorter-range missiles will be destroyed. The Soviet-U.S. treaty on their elimination took effect on the day of exchange of the instruments of ratification at the Moscow summit meeting, signifying the beginning of the age of nuclear disarmament.

Following the course of glasnost and openness on disarmament issues, the Soviet Union invited the U.N. secretary-general, representatives of member states of the Security Council, Zimbabwe, whose president is the current chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement, and delegates of the conference on disarmament to attend one of the first procedures to destroy missiles.

The Soviet Union started implementing obligations stemming from the treaty in advance, before the treaty took effect. The withdrawal of Soviet shorter-range missiles OTR-22 and OTR-23 (SS-12 and SS-23) from the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia started in February. They are delivered to a missile site at Saryozek in the Kazakh desert for destruction. The first batch of Soviet missiles was blown up there on a trial basis.

Late last week, scores of foreign journalists from the United States, Britain, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Belgium and other countries visited the Soviet military base at Sarniy, the western Ukraine. They familiarized themselves with all stages of dismantling and eliminating launchers and transporters for medium-range missiles RSD-10, known in the West as SS-20. The missiles of this class will be destroyed at the Kapustin Yar base in the Volgograd region.

As for the warheads of the medium- and shorter-range missiles, their frames will be destroyed together with boosters, while the charge will be removed and converted for use in the economy.

Communist Leaders Briefed on Summit
PM1006145988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jun 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Soviet Representatives Give Briefings"]

[Excerpt] During meetings and conversations with statesmen and politicians from foreign countries, special representatives of the Soviet leadership gave briefings on the results of the meeting in Moscow between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan.

Nguyen Van Linh, general secretary of the Communist Party of Vietnam (CPV) Central Committee, received B.N. Chaplin, special envoy of the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and USSR deputy foreign minister.

The Vietnamese leader appraised highly the meeting in Moscow. Its results are an important landmark in deepening international detente and improving Soviet-U.S. relations and will benefit peace throughout the world.

Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Workers Party of Korea (WPK) Central Committee and president of the DPRK, received A.S. Kapto, special envoy of the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and first deputy chief of a CPSU Central Committee department. The Korean side appraised highly the efforts of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in the name of peace and declared its full support for the Soviet initiatives and practical steps designed to remove the nuclear threat, create a comprehensive international security system, and unblock conflict situations in various parts of the world. The Korean side confirmed the DPRK's invariable policy to strive for a peaceful solution to the Korean problem through dialogue and negotiation.

Kim Il-song expressed deep satisfaction with the state of relations between the WPK and the CPSU and between the DPRK and the USSR and spoke in favor of deepening and developing them further.

L. Mojsov, member of the SFRY Presidium, had a meeting with A.L. Adamishin, USSR deputy foreign minister.

L. Mojsov stressed that the very fact of the dialogue and the results achieved during it are having a favorable impact on the international situation and make it possible to hope that the change for the better, which is in the interests of all states, is becoming stable.

Jose Eduardo dos Santos, chairman of the Popular Liberation Movement of Angola Party of Labor (MPLA-PT) and Angolan president, received V.M. Vasev, member of the USSR Foreign Ministry Collegium. The Angolan leader spoke in support of the Soviet-U.S. political dialogue and appraised highly the talks between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan. The Moscow summit meeting, J.E. dos Santos emphasized, is a major event in international life which opens up prospects of further improvement in the world situation, including in southern Africa. [passage omitted]

Pact Defense Ministers Visit Exercise Area
PM0806154788 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Jun 88 First Edition p3

[TASS report: "Visit to Exercise Region"]

[Text] Warsaw, 7 Jun—The region of Poland where the command-staff exercise "Shield-88" is being conducted under the leadership of Army General F. Siwicki, Polish national defense minister, has been visited by Army General W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee and chairman of the Polish Council of State. He was accompanied by J. Baryla and C. Kiszczak, members of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo.

Army General W. Jaruzelski was acquainted with the work of commanders and staffs on carrying out the set tasks and with troop control in defense conditions.

He met with the Warsaw Pact defense ministers present at the exercise: from the GDR, Army General H. Kessler; from Romania, Colonel General V. Milea; from the Soviet Union, Army General D.T. Yazov; from the CSSR, Army General M. Vaclavik; from Bulgaria, Colonel General K. Dobrev, first deputy defense minister; and from Hungary, Lieutenant General L. Morocz, first deputy defense minister. He also met with Marshal of the Soviet Union V.G. Kulikov, commander in chief of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces, and Army General A.I. Gribkov, chief of staff of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces.

Conference Held on Fighting Drug Addiction
LD0806232588 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1530 GMT 8 Jun 88

[Text] A working meeting of officials of internal affairs bodies from Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, the CSSR, and the Soviet Union dedicated to the problems of fighting drug addiction is under way in Tashkent. Our correspondent Ertin Rasimov reports:

[Rasimov] The forms and methods of the fight against drug addiction is perhaps the main theme of the Tashkent meeting. Nowadays nobody is concealing that just the number of registered drug addicts in our country amounts to tens of thousands. Recently in Uzbekistan alone, as a result of successfully conducted operations, the production and sale of narcotics output totaling 250 million rubles have been staved off. The efficiency of the antidrug campaign would be noticeably higher if medical staff actively joined in this work. But alas, our health care in localities is often trying to dodge the issue. And as if this was not enough—and the evidence of this is

provided by a number of criminal cases instigated by militia employees—the medical employees themselves promote the circulation of narcotic medicines. In this respect, the meeting in Tashkent, in which health care employees participate side by side with militia representatives, will help in drawing up a joint program the purpose of which is, of course, uprooting drug addiction.

The Soviet delegation to the Tashkent meeting is headed by Lieutenant General (Pamyakin), chief of the Criminal Investigation Main Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs. Vladislav Kirilovich, what is the reason for holding this meeting in Tashkent?

[Pamaykin] The operational situation is complex here, and despite the complexity a certain experience from fighting drug addiction has been accumulated here and stimulates interest for both our country and the participants of this working meeting. We need to study the experience, because the fight against drug addiction in all its forms and methods was drawn up in our country recently. We have a few effective forms. But good experience has been accumulated in countries participating in this meeting. This is one thing. The second thing is that under glasnost and the conditions of expanding economic ties with these countries the need is growing to jointly fight drug addiction.

Shevardnadze Meets Press, Departs New York

Embassy Press Statement

LD1006233388 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2115 GMT 10 Jun 88

[Text] New York, 11 Jun (TASS)—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, held a press conference on Friday at the USSR mission at the UN.

He said:

Ladies and Gentlemen, Esteemed Comrades!

I cordially welcome you to our mission and thank you for taking part in our press conference. I have decided to make a statement lasting about 15 minutes. I think you will have enough patience to hear me out, and then we will answer questions.

Of late the U.S. written and electronic press has been giving extensive coverage to reports from Moscow. The meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and President R. Reagan has aroused enormous interest. We judge this by the impressive body of journalists that covered the Moscow dialogue, and by the number of articles about it. In connection with the summit meeting, there have been many other materials about the Soviet Union, our people, the process of democratization and renewal that is taking place in our country, and the accelerated socioeconomic development of our homeland.

Because of this, we had hesitations and doubts as to whether we should hold this news conference.

We decided we should. Because, in our view, there is a need to issue a reminder that the sphere of disarmament is of the highest importance and it demands close and constant attention.

It seemed to us that the special session of the UN General Assembly on disarmament, as a very major event in world politics, would attract the close attention of the world's press. However, as far as I can judge by the information at my disposal—and the information that reaches me is voluminous—this big event has not as yet received broad press coverage.

This complaint is addressed not to those sitting in this hall, but to other mass news media.

What is the reason for such stinginess?

This phenomenon must be looked into.

One gets the feeling that disarmament could fall victim to its own first, genuinely historic success. The treaty on eliminating medium- and shorter-range missiles has come into force. The prospect of concluding an agreement on cutting by half strategic offensive weapons in conditions of observance of the ABM Treaty is taking shape, as is the prospect of concluding such an agreement with the current administration, and this should also be mentioned.

We have squeezed the arms race and are creating a certain safety margin as far as the nuclear threat is concerned. But we cannot say that the idea of disarmament has triumphed. The ink had not even dried on the protocol on exchanging ratification instruments when voices started to be heard asking whether disarmament had not perhaps gone too far. There are calls for caution and even vigilance in the face of a new threat, so to speak—"the threat of disarmament."

If anyone needs to display vigilance, and at the same time persistence in striving toward the goal, then it is the champions of disarmament. For disarmament will not become a stable dominating tendency if we do not make it all-embracing, if it marks time instead of moving ahead, and only ahead, through the efforts of all states and the entire world community.

In its address at the special session of the UN General Assembly, the Soviet delegation tried to expound both philosophical-doctrinal views, ways of moving toward a secure world, and practical ideas on the subject.

It is not for us to judge the extent to which we managed to do it convincingly.

However, it is, quite honestly, somewhat surprising that certain professional interpreters of politics peel off from events only the topmost, "newsworthy," as it were, layer, adopting a rather simplistic approach to the highly complex problems of disarmament. They seem to be awaiting some magic word, after which a miracle or, to put it simply, a sensation will take place.

But there are no miracles in politics, and changes occur slowly as a result of persistent work of very dogged, I would say, struggle, of the directed search for a balance of interests, and agreement about ultimate goals.

If one is not to be hypocritical, but to seriously seek disarmament, one must take the current reality the way it is and, on the basis of that, determine how to proceed toward a different situation: away from the arms race and the risk of conflict, and toward lasting peace at a minimal level of armaments.

Essentially, this is a new quality of life on our planet and a new level of world civilization.

It sometimes seems to certain politicians that it is they who select the direction and speed of movement. However, not infrequently, huge changes come about without them. History has her own logic and her own, deeply motivated route.

A power had, let us say, colonies overseas, and this was considered the unshakable status quo. But when the moment came, the American Revolution took place.

Autocracy appeared eternal, but our revolution put an end to it.

Nuclear weapons were believed inviolable, but now we are starting to scrap them.

The world restructures itself according to the laws of internal development, and if yesterday war was deemed to be an essential fact of life, then today—before the very eyes of the community—weapons, and particularly weapons of mass destruction, are becoming just as unacceptable as the industrial emissions destroying the natural environment.

In present-day life, anxious wisdom and amazing thoughtlessness coexist in a strange war.

While worrying about preserving the ozone layer over our planet, we are creating something that, in minutes, could destroy our world.

This can hardly continue ad infinitum. Just as for ecological resources, there is a limit to how far overloading with weapons can go. But while the risk is great, the resolve to do away with its danger is just as great.

How do we propose to act? I would like to recall a few things mentioned at the special session.

First: to continue the process of eliminating nuclear arms and to prohibit chemical weapons and begin eliminating them. These are perfectly real tasks which confront mankind.

Second: to begin deep cuts in troops and conventional weapons, above all in Europe, where most of them are and they are beyond all measure. We have set out our conception regarding this. We are willing to discuss this conception with any representatives of any states, public organizations, scientists, etc.

Third: I ask you to devote particular attention to this tenet: to disarm right across the board, making no exceptions. Weapons are weapons, whether they are located on land, underground, on the sea or in the sea depths, in the air, or in space.

Fourth: to recognize that it is unacceptable for troops and weapons to be deployed on the territory of other countries, to return them to within the national boundaries, and to liquidate all military bases on foreign soil. This issue has also come of age. Nor to abuse the hospitality of other countries, other states. They have the right to know whether there are nuclear weapons on board ships entering their ports.

Fifth: Not to separate, still less to oppose, our own security and the security of others; to take into account the interests of our partners and of the entire world community; to renounce national egoism; and in all cases to seek mutually acceptable solutions.

Sixth: to develop a system of monitoring [kontrol], verification [proverki], and inspection, and strive to ensure their 100-percent reliability in averting violations of agreements and of obligations which have been undertaken. To pass to a practice of maximal openness [otkrytost] in the military sphere.

Seventh: proceeding from the fact that the world is a single entity and its security indivisible, to work toward handing over the functions of maintaining international peace and international security to a universal international organization, the United Nations, and to the institutions and mechanisms set up under its aegis in accordance with the UN Charter.

Such are the main principles and the highroads that we must follow in order to preserve, to save our civilization.

Guided by a realistic vision of the outlook based on the new political thinking, the Soviet leadership carried out thorough preparation for the special session on disarmament and studied with special attentiveness the ideas and proposals that had been submitted for examination by the world community.

We do not consider our thoughts to be the final truth. They merely outline a range of problems and possible ways of solving them.

We are willing to listen carefully to the opinions of other countries, other governments, representatives of the public, public organizations, and the press, and work together with everyone to draw up a global concept of disarmament.

The Soviet Union regards the special session of the UN General Assembly as an important stage in this titanic, gigantic work.

We wanted to inform you of our view of the special session of the General Assembly. Thank you for responding to our invitation.

Eduard Shevardnadze then answered questions from the journalists.

Comments on Afghan Withdrawal

LD1006214988 Moscow TASS in English 2142 GMT 10 Jun 88

[Text] New York June 10 TASS—TASS correspondents Vyacheslav Chernyshev and Vitaliy Chukseyev report:

Member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Eduard Shevardnadze held a press conference at the USSR mission at the United Nations today. He shared at the press conference his views about the work of the third special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament and answered questions from newsmen.

Eduard Shevardnadze noted that the area of disarmament is an area of extreme importance which requires constant attention. "With the coming into force of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles we have rolled back the arms race and lessened nuclear menace somewhat. We are a few paces away from a still larger goal, cutting strategic offensive arms by half in conditions of the observance of the ABM Treaty", the Soviet minister said. "At the same time we cannot say that the idea of disarmament has already triumphed. A major event of world politics, such as the special session, has not been given sufficient attention and broad enough coverage by the press."

The Soviet leadership has carried out a thorough preparation for the special session, Eduard Shevardnadze said. As a result, the USSR delegation set out both philosophical views on the roads of advance toward a secure world and practical considerations on this matter. The Soviet Union proposes to continue the process of the elimination of nuclear arms, to ban chemical weapons and embark on their destruction, to start deep cuts in forces and conventional armaments, above all in Europe. He called special attention to the need for disarmament across the board, without any exceptions—on earth, underground, at sea or at ocean depths, in the air, or in outer space. The head of the Soviet delegation also pointed to the impermissibility of deploying troops and armaments on the territories of other countries and to the need for elimination of all military bases from lands of others. Answering a question from a TASS correspondent, he said that it is necessary to carry the matters to the transfer of peace-keeping functions and ensurance of security to the universal world organization—the United Nations.

Eduard Shevardnadze noted that the Soviet proposals have been given a most positive appraisal by many delegations at the special session and by the United Nations secretary-general. "As a result of the meetings I had in New York, I realised there exists a wide-spread concern as to how Soviet-American relations develop in future", he said. "The absolute majority of people declare in favour of their further normalisation."

Commenting on the participation of representatives of the peace forces—people's diplomacy—in the work of the special session, the Soviet minister said that a truly people's assembly is now underway in New York. This is a great power to be reckoned with by all politicians.

A number of questions put at the press conference was about the state of affairs in the Middle East and the settlement relating to Afghanistan. The head of the Soviet delegation emphasized that it is only by convening an international conference under the United Nations auspices and on the basis of balancing the interests of all the parties that the Middle East problem can be resolved. He was asked who opposes the settlement of the Afghan conflict and what prospects for the solution of that problem are. "When we criticize Pakistan for not observing the Geneva accords and not honouring the obligations assumed, we, of course, mean that the United States also bears a certain responsibility for this", the minister said. "And the United States, just as the Soviet Union, is a guarantor of the accords. I would like to say it should be taken into consideration that the Soviet Union stringently observes all the articles of the Geneva accords. It is a matter for Afghans themselves how the events develop in Afghanistan. Afghans can agree among themselves if they are not interfered with. If violations by Pakistan continue, we shall have to review the schedule of the Soviet troop withdrawal," Eduard Shevardnadze said. "This will be an extreme and enforced measures which we would not like to take".

Departs for Moscow 10 Jun

LD1006224688 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2220 GMT 10 Jun 88

[Text] New York 11 June (TASS)—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, left Friday for Moscow.

He had been taking part in the third United Nations General Assembly special session on disarmament.

Moscow Arrival Reported

LD1106163388 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 11 Jun 88

[Text] Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, returned to Moscow from New York today. He had attended the U.N. General Assembly's third session on disarmament. He was met at the airport by Yakovlev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and Central Committee secretary, and by other officials.

Further Reportage on UN Disarmament Session

Joint Statement Circulated

LD1106033788 Moscow TASS in English 2316 GMT 10 Jun 88

[Text] New York June 11 TASS—The joint Soviet-American statement issued following the Moscow summit was circulated at the United Nations Headquarters as an official document of the third special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament.

Proposals Cited

LD1106215288 Moscow TASS in English 1242 GMT 11 Jun 88

[Text] New York June 11 TASS—At the U.N. General Assembly's third special session in disarmament, the delegations of many countries come forward with specific proposals which are aimed at solving the problems of curbing the arms race.

Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and Czechoslovakia suggested taking effective measures to raise the role of the United Nations Organization in the field of disarmament and efficiency of the disarmament mechanism. They pointed out in a working document submitted to the session that now as never before the UNO can and must act as a true centre for coordinating the actions of all countries in the name of saving the present and succeeding generations from the scourge of war.

The participation of the UNO in solving the problem of eliminating arms, first of all, nuclear ones, the sponsors of the document hold, could have been more effective if all the resources of the U.N. Security Council were used to the full.

The German Democratic Republic (GDR) drew the attention of the delegates to the special session to the importance of establishing nuclear-free zones which would in many respects contribute to ridding the world of nuclear arms and would become an important contribution by non-nuclear countries to the nuclear disarmament process.

Such zones have already become a political reality sealed in the Tlatelolco Treaty, the Rarotonga Treaty, the Antarctic Treaty, and the treaty banning the deployment of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the seabed and ocean floor and the subsoil thereof.

Many proposals on establishing nuclear-free zones in the African and Asian Continents and other regions were put forward.

The question of establishing nuclear-free zones in Europe, where the concentration of nuclear arms has reached a particularly dangerous level, is topical as never before, the GDR maintains.

The Netherlands and Sweden suggested discussing the question of a ban on attacks on nuclear plants.

Ukrainian Addresses Session

LD1106222388 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0949 GMT 11 Jun 88

[Text] New York, 11 Jun (TASS)—V [illegible] minister of foreign affairs of the Ukrainian SSR, described the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles as "the first shoot of nuclear disarmament which has broken through the concrete layer of the prejudices and stereotypes of hostility." He was speaking on Friday in the general debate at the third special session ofthe UN General Assembly on Disarmament.

This treaty, the minister emphasized, may quite justifiably be considered a joint triumph of the wisdom and collective will of the whole international community. The Ukrainian SSR, like many UN member-states, is resolutely against the outbreak of a qualitatively new spiral of the arms race under the pretext of creating a "cosmic shield" at this time when the disarmament process has acquired real form. It is important that each member of the international community realizes its portion of responsibility for the fate of peace, the Ukrainian representative stressed, so that we can have a practical situation whereby the bilateral and multilateral processes of disarmament mutually augment and reinforce one another.

The leader of the Ukrainian SSR delegation described the Soviet Union's position, as set out in the speech at the special session by E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, as a convincing example of constructiveness and determination to take profound and radical measures on disarmament, which the partners in the talks would be prepared for, without at the same time threatening anyone's security and without infringing upon the legitimate interests of states.

Urging the assembly to support the Soviet initiatives, the Ukrainian representative noted that the USSR's new important specific proposals were aimed at imparting the process of disarmament with a constant, consistently growing, and deepening nature.

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable'

LD1206205488 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 12 Jun 88

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Boris Andrianov, All-Union Radio Foreign political commentator; Nikolay Ivanovich Agayants, international affairs journalist and foreign political commentator; and Vadim Borisovich Kassis, GOLOS RODINY and OTCHIZNA editor in chief]

[Text] [Andrianov] Hello, comrades. The further the Soviet-U.S. summit in Moscow recedes from the present, the more clearly and boldly its significance stands out. In truth, great things are seen at a distance. And whether we like it or not, it is in light of that event that we regard the processes and phenomena of contemporary world politics and adjust our attitude toward them: Whether it be regional conflicts, or trade and economic relations between various countries, or whether it be the special third session of the UN General Assembly on disarmament, or humanitarian issues. Thus the new political

thinking in international relations is making itself felt: That new thinking that has been developed and is being introduced patiently and consistently by our party and our government since the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

[Agayants] As is noted in the published Theses for the 19th all-union party conference, restructuring in our country has become a factor of worldwide significance. Possessing the power to exert a positive influence on peace, it naturally needed a foreign policy that would adequately reflect its essentially humanistic nature. It demanded a democratization of our international contacts and a different position for the Soviet Union in the worldwide division of labor. As we know, critical analysis of the past has shown that dogmatism and the subjectivist approach have left their mark even on our foreign policy, that it was affected by the unhappily remembered years of stagnation because it was allowed to fall behind fundamental changes in the world. The new possibilities of lowering tension and creating greater mutual understanding and trust between nations were not being fully realized. In the past, while striving for military and strategic parity, we did not always exploit opportunities to obtain security for our socialist state by political means; and as a result, we allowed ourselves to be drawn into the arms race. This could not fail to affect—and did, alas, affect—the socioeconomic development of the country and its international position.

[Kassis] Now, our policy is based on the new thinking, which we've already mentioned: A consistent and scientific thinking, emancipated from historically obsolete stereotypes. It is necessary to emphasize that it reflects the realities of the modern world, which is diverse and contradictory and fraught with global threats to the very existence of the human race, while also possessing a huge potential for coexistence and cooperation and for solving acute problems by political means.

[Andrianov] This new political thinking, incidentally, has enabled us to put forward a number of major ideas, which have captured the imagination of an anxious world.

[Agayants] We were working along those same lines when we drew up the memorandum in which we presented the plans of the socialist community at the third special session of the UN General Assembly on disarmament.

[Kassis] I don't think there is any point in giving an account of the memorandum here at our roundtable. But there is one aspect—in keeping with what we've been talking about—that we should, perhaps, say something about. The delegations of the Warsaw Pact member-states pointed out in the memorandum that disarmament is the highroad to achieving genuine security, which must be achieved by parallel efforts in all spheres of the approach to providing security; and this must be promoted by the development of a comprehensive dialogue on the vital problems of our time.

[Andrianov] And here I think we must say something about the speech by Soviet Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze at the third special session of the UN General Assembly on disarmament in New York. It has evoked an enormous amount of comment from the foreign media, and prominent political and public figures of various countries are still returning to it today because it is a detailed plan of action in the sphere of disarmament for the future. It is a plan that is utterly concrete, a difficult plan, but one that is entirely feasible. A reality has been born that mankind has never before known. A new state of the world has been born that resembles, in significance, an overcoming of the force of gravity. At long last, those antigravitational forces have been released which, as they build up, are capable in time of interrupting the gravitation toward armament and putting an end to the age-old dependence on them. That's only the beginning, but it brings us to a stage that is qualitatively so new that its interpretation requires collective efforts. That is what Comrade Shevardnadze said when speaking of the treaty to scrap medium and shorter range missiles which has now come into force.

[Agayants] The Soviet Union has submitted for consideration by the representative forum on disarmament in New York a number of proposals that could undoubtedly make up elements of a new platform of disarmament in the years following the beginning of the physical elimination of nuclear weapons. Today the world community sees before it a real prospect of removing from the arsenals 13,000 nuclear warheads. We are convinced that an agreement to reduce strategic offensive arms by 50 percent under conditions of observance of the ABM Treaty will be signed. The next thing that needs to be done is to seek and elaborate other—political—means, for the purpose of building a nuclear-free world.

What, then, is being proposed? First, as E.A. Shevardnadze noted in his address to the third special session of the UN General Assembly, we face two strategic tasks: To expand and deepen the disarmament process without allowing the pace that has been achieved to slacken; and to build security now on a different qualitative level.

[Kassis] One of the most important tasks of the world community and of the forums operating within the system of the United Nations that are directly concerned with disarmament is, as our proposals note, the shaping of a disarmament concept that must be based on the idea of the modern world as a single interdependent entity. One would like to see the whole process of disarmament—and correspondingly, the system of monitoring [kontrol]—as forming an equally integrated whole.

In addition to the other initiatives put forward by us—specifically those dealing with negotiations on conventional armed forces and armaments, or, say, with the

necessary curbs on developing ever more destructive types of conventional weapon systems—the Soviet Union has supported the proposal of the states of the Nonaligned Movement for the cessation and banning of the use of scientific and technical achievements for the development and production of new generations and types of weapons of mass destruction, and also of conventional weapon types and systems.

[Agayants] At the junction of the most important military and political problems of our time lies the issue of military bases on foreign territory and of foreign military presence. This is the political pole, Comrade Shevardnadze noted, at which converge the meridians of international security and of the sovereignty, independence and national dignity of peoples and countries. The Soviet Union has set before the world community the task of abolishing by the year 2000 foreign military presence and military bases on foreign territory. A very important proposal!

[Andrianov] I'll add the following to what has been said. As we know, one of the most serious obstacles to settling regional conflicts is the fact that arms are being very vigorously pumped into the world's hot-spots—that is, into zones of heightened confrontation. And therefore our country has advocated restricting the sale and supply of conventional arms. As the examples of Nicaragua, Afghanistan, and Cambodia have recently shown, the possibilities for implementing a policy of national reconciliation largely depend on the stand taken by those countries that are continuing to do all they can to send arms to opposition forces and counterrevolutionary formations. Is it not for this reason that, despite all the remarkable accords that have been achieved, the process of settling regional conflicts are beginning to stall? [Kassis] Just the other day, the well-known U.S. observer James Reston published a lengthy article in THE NEW YORK TIMES, in which he says among other things that at the present time—I quote—there are 25 wars going on in the real world. Quoting data from the Washington research institute World Priorities, Reston juggles with the figures and reveals the geography of these regional conflicts—not forgetting Afghanistan of course. But how does he deal with it? You'd have thought he'd tell the reader why it is that blood is still being spilled on Afghan soil, with weapons still in the hands of the bandits who are killing defenseless women, old people, and children. But no, on this matter, the observer is tight-lipped.

[Andrianov] Well then, let us fill in what Reston put outside the brackets, as they say. It is well known that Pakistan, in violation of the agreements reached in Geneva on settling the situation around Afghanistan, is continuing to make its territory available for the implementation of arms supplies to the Afghan antigovernment formations. According to information that has come into the hands of honest Western journalists, the armed opposition, which is against national reconciliation in Afghanistan, has recently had placed at its disposal missile weaponry produced in the United States with a range of more than 30 km. It is asserted that these missiles, which have never been used in Afghanistan before, are capable of significantly intensifying the combat potential of the bandit formations. As a result of the use of such weaponry, in the opinion of specialists, the opposition groups will acquire the capability to freely bombard the regions of Kabul.

[Agayants] Here is a curious detail. Ronald Reagan, President of the United States, when delivering a radio address on the results of his visit to the Soviet Union and the summit meeting in Moscow, called the start of the withdrawal of the Soviet forces from Afghanistan an historic step and stressed here that the solution of this problem—I quote—could serve as a model for settling other regional conflicts. All this is true, of course. But, to all appearances, Washington is not only continuing to provide the rebels with arms, but is, in general, turning a blind eye to the Pakistani political games. Pakistan is, essentially, continuing its interference in Afghan affairs and not fulfilling its obligations within the framework of the accords concluded in Geneva.

[Kassis] Here is something else that should be said. The domestic political situation in Pakistan has been exacerbated, and very significantly, in the last few days. President Ziaul Haq has dismissed the prime minister and all the other members of the cabinet and dissolved the National Assembly. According to reports from news agencies in Islamabad, the differences of opinion between the president and the premier arose, in part, in connection with the fulfillment of the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan. The Chinese agency, XINHUA, for example, stresses that the prime minister, in contradistinction to Ziaul Haq, was seeking to accelerate the cessation of the military conflict and the return of the Afghan refugees from Pakistan.

[Andrianov] Yet meanwhile, the situation on the Afghan-Pakistani border is giving rise to more and more grounds for alarm. While Moscow and Kabul are strictly following the signed Geneva accords, the other parties to the agreement are inclined, to all appearances, to regard their implementation as a one-way process; but, at the same time, they are arguing a very great deal and very eloquently about the observance of the timetable for the withdrawal of the limited contingent of Soviet forces.

[Agayants] We can say even more. In the night, or even by day, columns of Pakistani army trucks approach the border in individual border areas with arms for the opposition. From there they are taken deep into Afghan territory. As before, the advanced stores of the extremists' bases are crammed solid with the most varied weaponry. One can give their addresses: Vama, Navagai, (Pishimye), Yarokarez and others. The detachments belonging to the so-called Islamic Party of Afghanistan, led by Hikmatyar, who is not unknown—the very same man who again directed threats at the Afghan republic a

few days ago—have not shifted either. The ringleaders of the Alliance of Seven are still residing and conducting their subversive activity at their old addresses in Peshawar.

[Kassis] It should be noted that Ahmad Shah, one of the ringleaders of those Afghan counterrevolutionaries, has already been proclaimed by his stooges as head of a future provisional government. Overtly offensive attacks against the legitimate government of Kabul from officials in Islamabad, including the Pakistani president himself, are also causing bewilderment at the very least. Thus, the opposition is being openly incited to continue the fratricidal war and promises to continue arms supplies to the Afghan rebels are pouring forth.

[Andrianov] The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Afghanistan has already sent the group of UN observers in Kabul more than 15 notes in connection with this situation, complaining about violations of the provisions of the Geneva accords by the Pakistani side. These notes enumerate, with precise references to the place and time, the facts of these flagrant violations. But what is typical? We have not yet received any information in reply from the observers about investigations of the violations or from Pakistan about measures that have been taken, Farid Zarif, deputy minister of foreign affairs of Afghanistan, stated at a meeting with journalists. [Agayants] Incidentally, it will soon be a month since the group of observers, consisting of two staff subunits in Kabul and Islamabad, started to operate. According to reports from agencies, not a single complaint about difficulties or problems in their fulfillment of their functions on the territory of the republic has come from the Afghan group of observers. On the contrary, it is being noted that all the necessary conditions have been created for the activity of the observers who are keeping a record of the stage-by-stage withdrawal of the Soviet forces.

[Kassis] I would like to return again to the Afghan notes. The point is that one of them dealt with foreign advisers who are operating within the armed detachments of rebels on the territory of Afghanistan. This is what Farid Zarif, deputy minister of foreign affairs, stated on this matter, for example: I quote—We are in possession of evidence that, even after Geneva, foreign advisers have penetrated from Pakistan onto Afghan territory with armed extremist groups. They are helping their proteges to develop a network of military centers in regions of the demilitarized border zone that the Afghan Government set up in the interests of a calm return of the refugees. For example, 14 foreign advisers are rendering assistance to the detachment led by Mullah Tor; 7 others are giving advice to the armed group of a certain Khodi; and there are others, too.

[Andrianov] All this testifies once more to the two-faced approach of the Pakistani authorities to the settlement of the Afghan problem.

[Agayants] Here is something else that one cannot help seeing and saying. If Islamabad were in lonely isolation, it would never dare to act in the insolent manner in which it is behaving. The United States is behind all its unscrupulous actions.

[Andrianov] Najibullah, president of the Republic of Afghanistan, spoke at the third special session of the UN General Assembly on disarmament last Tuesday. He provided a detailed analysis of the whole situation around Afghanistan and noted that the actions of the Pakistani authorities are not only violating the letter and the spirit of the accords, but are also an insult to the United Nations. Najibullah stressed that Kabul sees ways of settling the conflict exclusively on a peaceful basis, without foreign military bases on the territory of Afghanistan.

[Agayants] The process of settling the regional conflict around Afghanistan is continuing, in spite of all the difficulties. But, after all, this is not the only hot spot on the Asian Continent. The acrid smoke of other armed conflicts is also rising there. Moreover, such small wars conceal a highly serious danger in our nuclear age—and not only for regional stability and security, but also for peace in the whole world, for we are living in an interrelated world. For this reason, it is enough to make just one false step for the flame of a local conflict to become like a steppe fire in dry, windy weather and to start devouring a wide area of our world.

[Kassis] Here is one of those hot centers of trouble: the so-called Cambodian problem has been around for 9 years already. It is no secret what a negative influence it is having on the entire Southeast Asian situation and on the international atmosphere as a whole. Can it be any wonder that the conflict in Indochina has long been worrying all the peace-loving public and forcing it to attentively follow what is going on in Cambodia itself and around that country?

[Andrianov] By the way, all manner of conjectures are being put forth about regarding people's Cambodia, its internal situation, and the policy of the legitimate government of the republic. They are becoming the subject of overt political speculations. There is, of course, nothing odd about that, since outside forces that cannot come to terms with the victory of people's power in Cambodia are resorting to such methods. This is why they are continuing their subversive activity against the young republic, making use of the armed opposition groups.

[Agayants] However, time has shown that the opponents of the People's Republic of Kampuchea who are entrenched beyond its borders will not be able to overthrow people's power on Khmer soil by armed means. After all, it is an obvious fact that the foes of the young state have simply not managed to consolidate a hold in any region of the country in the course of 9 years. The point here is not only that the Vietnamese volunteers are on the territory of Cambodia, of course; to confine

oneself just to that explanation is tantamount to a gross distortion of the truth. The present Government of Cambodia controls the situation on the whole territory of the country, because the people give it trust and support. It is precisely for this reason that the opponents of the republic have not managed to turn its development back.

Having set off on the road of national construction, the Cambodian people are feeling in real terms the beneficial nature of their own choice and are achieving significant progress in various spheres of the economy and public and cultural life. All these are influential factors that have aided the fact that people's power in Cambodia has grown significantly stronger and its armed forces have now acquired the ability to independently fulfill the tasks of defending the achievements of the revolution. [Kassis] Nevertheless, the Khmer opposition is not laying down its arms or stopping its armed raids on Cambodian settlements. This is why Cambodia still lives both under peace and war conditions. A peaceful situation prevails on the greater part of the country's territory. Military activity flares up briefly in odd regions. But even these clashes cause much misfortune to the population. The blood of peaceful citizens is being spilled. Material assets are being pointlessly destroyed. The number of refugees driven from their homes by the flame of the conflict fails to drop. To put out the fire and find a peaceful compromise solution to the Cambodian problem are the goals that the republican government has set itself.

[Andrianov] It is not only the goal that it has determined; it has also selected an effective means of attaining it—the policy of national reconciliation that is being conducted by the Cambodian Government. You remember, of course, that a few months ago now it put forward a plan for the unification of all patriotic forces in the name of building in the country a just and progressive society based on equal rights. The main principle of this program is also known. The fate of Cambodia must be determined by the Cambodians themselves. Having shown good will, Phnom Penh expressed willingness to meet the leaders of all the Khmer opposition groupings except for Pol Pot and his closest associates who have besmirched their reputation by monstrous crimes. It was proposed that these meetings should discuss specific ways of national reconciliation.

[Agayants] And in fact, this patriotic appeal has been heard, above all by the ordinary members of the opposition groupings, at any rate by those who are now leaving the ranks of the opposition and returning home. It has lately become known that at present, among other things, the repatriation of Cambodian refugees from Thailand is in the offing. This is the first swallow, as it were, a harbinger of spring. So, one can now speak without any exaggeration about the quite definite positive change that has begun.

[Kassis] I believe that the two rounds of talks that have been held by Hun Sen, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, with Prince Norodom Sihanouk, who heads one of the opposition groupings, have also played a certain role. One should not overestimate these meetings, of course. But at the same time it would be a mistake not to do them justice. Surely they have terminated the deadend in which the Cambodian problem had become trapped. A discussion of specific matters has started. What is more, a unity of views has been attained on some of them. It is quite natural that it is simply impossible to resolve all the problems at one sitting. Over the years of the military conflict a great many of them have piled up. In order to work them out it is necessary to continue with contacts. This is required by the country's interests and the policy of national reconciliation—if all the sides will take an attitude to it based on a sense of great political responsibility for the future of Cambodia, being conscious of the need for sensible compromises.

[Andrianov] Awareness of that responsibility, in my view, permeates the decision of the Cambodian and Vietnamese Governments to withdraw 50,000 Vietnamese volunteers from Cambodian territory this year—in other words, half of the personnel of the military contingent from the People's Republic of Vietnam which is stationed in that country. This is undoubtedly a major constructive contribution to the cause of settling the regional conflict in Southeast Asia, and to the process of the elimination of military tension and normalization of the situation in this region of the world.

[Kassis] For those who are trying to block the process of the peaceful settlement of the Cambodian question this solution has, by all accounts, placed them in a predicament. Surely it is not for nothing that they hurry to play down the significance of this initiative. Some of them have hastened to present it as another propagandist trick of Hanoi. Others assert that all this is designed to deceive the international public. Still others claim that there is nothing new in this new initiative.

I think it would not be wrong to say that this dissent reflects a certain element of confusion among those who wish ill on the policy of national reconciliation that is being persistently conducted by the Cambodian Government. They simply have no alternative to the specific solution proposed by Phnom Penh and Hanoi. So they have to make do with all sorts of inventions. But does one resort to them if all is well? Of course not! How can one assert, for example, that there is nothing new in this new initiative? Surely, there are quite a number of truly new points in it.

[Andrianov] They are deliberately not being noticed, although they are obvious. In particular, the status of the proportion of the Vietnamese contingent that will remain in Cambodia for the time being will be changed. It will be put at the disposal of the Cambodian Armed Forces, because the command of the Vietnamese volunteers in Cambodia will be transferred to Vietnam. At the same time it has been decided to draw off the remaining volunteer forces into the depths of Cambodian territory,

placing them at a distance of 30 km from the border with Thailand. The purpose of this relocation is clear: to set up a peace zone along the border. This will make it easier to solve the problem of the repatriation of Cambodian refugees from Thailand. Another thing: Representatives of all the countries and international organizations that show interest in resolving the Cambodian problem are invited to observe the troop withdrawal.

[Agayants] It is appropriate to remind you here of the fact that the final withdrawal of Vietnamese troops will end in 1990. However, it may well happen earlier if a political settlement is achieved. Why have I reminded you of the date for the final withdrawal? The reason is that about 2 weeks ago the Thai newspaper BANGKOK POST published an interview with Hun Sen. The head of the Cambodian Government said that he had received a message from Norodom Sihanouk proposing another meeting next year or in 1990. But what can we discuss with the prince in 2 years, Hun Sen asked: By 1990, there will be no Vietnamese troops left on Cambodian territory! Yet it is their presence that the opposition and those who stand behind it have been trying their best to pass off as the cause of the so-called Cambodian problem.

[Kassis] In this connection, and continuing this train of thought, as it were, I want to cite what Hun Sen said in his interview with the French AGENCE FRANCE PRESS. The head of the Cambodian Government called upon Norodom Sihanouk to come back for the talks as soon as possible if he really wants to play a role in the country's political future. The question that the former monarch is faced with, Hun Sen hinted, is this: Now or never. For after 1990 there will no longer be a Cambodian problem, since there will be no Vietnamese presence. The talks are now at a dead end, Hun Sen added; however the troop withdrawal is continuing. This shows that a settlement in Cambodia is not connected with the troop withdrawal.

[Andrianov] It follows that Norodom Sihanouk should hurry, especially because the new initiative in Phnom Penh and Hanoi is creating favorable opportunities for the dialogue between Hun Sen and the prince to continue to develop and for talks to be held between all the Cambodian sides taking into account the balance of their interests and recognizing existing realities. During his meeting last month with Thai Prime Minister Prem, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev outlined the Soviet approach to regional problems. Referring to the experience accumulated by the world community, Mikhail Sergeyevich emphasized that these conflicts, even the most complex and chronic of them, must be solved by way of a political settlement. There cannot be any military solution. This also fully applies to the Cambodian problem.

This concludes our meeting at the roundtable. All its participants thank you, esteemed comrade listeners, for your attention. Goodbye, and all the best.

East-West Security Conference Ends in Potsdam

GDR's Fischer Speaks

LD1006145488 Moscow TASS in English 2301 GMT 9 Jun 88

[Text] Potsdam June 9 TASS—TASS correspondent Aleksey Korniyenko and Igor Osinskiy report:

An international conference, "New Approach to East-West Security Problems", opened its proceedings here today. This is the seventh session held annually by the Institute on East-West Security Studies. This forum takes place in the socialist country for the first time.

The conference brought together eminent scientists and politicians from 20 countries of Europe and the United States. They will exchange views on the opportunities of and ways to deepen the political dialogue among states with differing social systems.

Delivering an opening address to the conference, Oskar Fischer, foreign minister of the German Democratic Republic, evaluated the current state of matters in international relations. "We stand at the beginning of a new, better phase in East-West relations", he said. "Today, when mankind encountered the threat of obliterating life on earth, it is impossible to ensure one's own security by acting alone, as before, to the detriment of other nations' interests. Peace and security can be attained only by joint effort, by peaceful cooperation and the way towards security is only one—through disarmament".

"The socialist countries proceed from the assumption that ideological rivalry cannot be shifted to inter-state relations. Such forms of co-existence should be found, which would be acceptable to all, would not infringe on someone's freedom and sovereignty", Fischer said.

"The Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Moscow has confirmed forcefully for one more time that there is no alternative to peaceful cooperation. It made an important contribution to enhancing security, laid down the foundation for concluding future agreements, first and foremost, an agreement on a 50 per cent reduction in strategic offensive armaments given scrupulous observance of the ABM Treaty. All countries should assist the efforts to deepen this process", Fischer stressed.

Aboymov Remarks Cited

LD1106224188 Moscow TASS in English 2004 GMT 11 Jun 88

[Text] Potsdam June 11 TASS—By TASS correspondents Igor Osinskiy and Aleksey Koriyenko:

An international conference, which considered a new approach to East-West security problems, ended its work in Potsdam today.

Speakers at the forum emphasised that East-West relations had now entered a new stage—a stage of open and frank dialogue and of a joint search for ways to strengthen peace and extend mutually beneficial cooperation.

West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher said that "the clearer our common responsibility the more anachronistic is what divides us".

"Step by step we learn to overcome mistrust of each other. The withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, the readiness for inspections of military facilities, the atmosphere of glasnost, frank acknowledgment of one's own shortcomings, including mistakes made in foreign policies in the past—these and other facts patently show that the Soviet Union is ready to sincerely participate in modernising international relations", Genscher said.

"The West should respond to this readiness and use the historic chance offered by the new type of political thinking of Soviet leaders," he said.

Gerhard Beil, foreign trade minister of the German Democratic Republic, welcomed the West's readiness to extend the political and economic dialogue.

He expressed the hope that capitalist states would remove artificial obstacles to mutually beneficial trade.

Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Ivan Aboymov, who led the Soviet delegation to the conference, told TASS that the conference had aroused much interest as the issues discussed at it were extremely important and topical.

He said that the Soviet delegation had explained in detail at the conference the Soviet Union's stand on all topical problems of international security, including efforts to achieve nuclear-free and non-violent peace, cuts in conventional and strategic offensive armaments, a chemical weapon ban, and others.

"The Soviet delegation's report included all aspects reflecting our approach to the formation of international security: military-political, economic, humanitarian and ecological," Aboymov said, adding that the Soviet proposals had evoked much interest.

He said the conference had shown much interest also in the results of the Soviet-American summit, prospects of Soviet-U.S. relations, and their significance for the destinies of peace and security.

"All the participants in the conference now face a common task of looking for joint ways to solve one of the most important problems of the times, that of strengthening international security," the head of the Soviet delegation said.

Chervov on Arms Reduction

LD1206114888 Hamburg DPA in German 0957 GMT 12 Jun 88

[Excerpts] Potsdam (DPA)—The foreign policy conference of a U.S. research institute in the GDR concluded on Saturday with a keynote speech by Federal Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher on security policy and "system-opening" cooperation by Europeans in West and East. [passage omitted] The conference veered toward confrontation when Colonel General Nikolay Chervov, head of a directorate of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, reproached the West with having answered none of the offers from the Warsaw Pact on conventional disarmament. He insistently rejected all Western reproaches that conventional disarmament had so far foundered on the rock of lack of Soviet data, saying this was slanderous propaganda.

A U.S. delegate reported that Chervov had not merely conceded Soviet superiority in certain spheres during the smaller sessions, but had also hinted at a readiness for reduction to Western levels. Officially Chervov offered on-site inspections for conventional disarmament, from tanks right down to the individual infantryman, "from the Atlantic to the Urals."

Kapitsa Addresses Mongolian Asia-Pacific Meeting

LD1006150488 Moscow TASS in English 2221 GMT 9 Jun 88

[Text] Ulaanbaatar June 9 TASS—TASS correspondent Kim Boldokhonov reports:

The international meeting "Ways and Means of Ensuring Peace and Cooperation in the Asian and Pacific Region" opened in the Mongolian capital today. It is attended by scientists and experts from Afghanistan, Australia, Vietnam, India, Canada, China, People's Democratic Republic of Korea, Laos, Mongolia, the Soviet Union, the USA and Japan. Namerain Sodnom, president of the Mongolian Academy of Sciences, greeted participants in the responsible meeting.

Meeting participants started a "round table" discussion of political, economic and military aspects in relations of the region's countries. They are engaged in a search for ways of lessening international tension, strengthening confidence and expanding cooperation in this biggest area of the world.

The report "Issues of All-Embracing Security in the Asian and Pacific Region" was delivered by Mikhail Kapitsa, director of the Oriental Studies Institute, USSR Academy of Sciences. He called attention of participants to the well-known Soviet initiatives whose aim is to turn Asia and the Pacific into a zone of peace. The Soviet proposals also take into account the ideas of Bandung, "Panch Sila" [extension of Bandung conference] and the Non-Aligned Movement. They are in tune with Mongolian proposals on concluding a treaty on non-use of force

and non-aggression of Asian and Pacific countries, proposals of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea on declaring the Korean peninsula a nuclear-free zone, of the Indochinese countries—on turning Southeast Asia into a zone of peace and stability.

The Soviet proposals are an invitation to collective thinking and pooling of efforts to find mutually acceptable solution so as to ensure peace and security in the region. The Soviet Union, two thirds of whose territory are in Asia, the scientist noted, links to this part of the country its plans for further economic development. There are also political motives. In the region there are countries, goodneighbourly relations with whom are regarded by the USSR as priority matters in its foreign policy. The USSR is interested in a peaceful and stable situation in the region and in decreasing the military threat, which would enable it to concentrate on efforts to tackle domestic tasks.

"The principled line for removing confrontation, a decrease in military activities, considerable reduction in ground forces and fleets, creation of zones of peace and introduction of confidence-building measures are an important element of the Soviet policy in the region," said the speaker further on. The Soviet Union deems it expedient to cut armed forces and conventional weapons in Asia down to levels of reasonable sufficiency. This problem can be settled stage-by-stage, starting with any area, for instance with the Far East. The USSR expresses readiness to translate into practical work the drafting of measures on strengthening of confidence and non-use of force in the region, said the Soviet representative in conclusion.

United States & Canada

Deploying SDI Means 'Grave Destabilization'

LD1106133588 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 11 Jun 88

[Text] The United States Congress is finishing a debate on the federal budget for the next fiscal year, beginning 1 October. The most controversial point concerns the allocations for the Strategic Defense Initiative, known as the Star Wars program. Both the Senate and the House of Representatives were for cutting the sums requested by the White House for the SDI development. Our commentator Yuriy Solton thinks that Congress had been influenced by sharp criticism leveled at the SDI by leading American scientists and military experts.

I have studied the recently published unclassified report by the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment, writes Yuriy Solton. The report is based on public and secret sources and evaluation of the SDI program by the leading experts. The conclusions are unfavorable for the supporters of the SDI. Analyzing the Pentagon's assertion that it would be possible to deploy the first stage of the antimissile defense by the mid'90s, experts find it based on extremely optimistic forecasts. Even if such a system would be created, says the report, it would be good to destroy only a small part of the attacking missiles and consequently fit only to defend select, most vital military facilities of the United States.

This, to my mind, expresses the very gist of the SDI program. It is not to be a space shield to protect the American people from a nuclear strike but to safeguard certain military targets—in other words, the silos with strategic offensive missiles.

I am amazed by the tenacity with which the American Administration and the President are defending SDI. Their adherence to the program has become the main hindrance on the way toward an agreement on halving the Soviet and American strategic arms and prevented preparing such a treaty for the time of the Moscow summit meeting. A full implementation of the SDI program is fraught with a grave destabilization of the world situation. The American President was frankly told so in Moscow.

If necessary, the Soviet Union would take measures to neutralize the SDI program. That wouldn't be too difficult, but we are against the new space spiral of the arms race.

Yuriy Solton concludes that no task is more vital in the field of disarmament than the prevention of spreading armaments to outer space.

Reagan Urges Congress To Work on New Trade Bill

LD1206084588 Moscow TASS in English 0809 GMT 12 Jun 88

[Text] Washington June 12 TASS—TASS correspondent Igor Barsukov reports:

President Ronald Reagan in a weekly Saturday radio address urged the U.S. Congress to work out a new trade bill which would contribute to raising the competitive power of American commodities on the world markets and to creating new job opportunities in the United States.

"I can think of no surer way of derailing our economy than to try, through protectionist measures, to seal America off from trade and investment with the other countries of the world", Reagan said.

The President emphasized that he had directed his senior advisers to stand ready to assist the congressional leadership in drafting a new trade bill.

At the end of May the U.S. President vetoed the trade bill which had been earlier worked out by Congress. The administration agreed with most provisions of the document which was aimed at broadening access to foreign markets for American commodities, and objected only to the toughest protectionist measures with regard to U.S. trading partners. However, the White House strongly opposed the bill's provision which urged the management of American companies to notify their workers and employees 60 days prior to an upcoming closure of the enterprise or to dismissals.

When substantiating his stand, Reagan had maintained that the demand would deprive the employers of flexibility and would ultimately be of detriment to the country's economy.

The House of Representatives voted for overriding the President's veto. However, the Senate advocates of the trade bill during their June 8 vote failed to poll a two-thirds majority of votes necessary for overriding the veto. So, work on a new trade bill will begin afresh.

Reagan Sends Special Message to Senate on INF

LD1106110288 Moscow TASS in English 1047 GMT 11 Jun 88

[Text] Washington June 11 TASS—By TASS correspondent Igor Igantyev:

President Reagan on Friday said he was gratified the U.S. Senate gave "its advice and consent" to the ratification of the treaty on the elimination of Soviet and U.S. intermediate- and shorter-range missiles.

In a special message to the Senate, the U.S. President noted that it was his "honour" to exchange instruments of ratification on entry into force of the treaty at the

summit meeting in Moscow. The President expressed the hope that that event "will lead to even more important advances in arms reduction and the preservation of world peace and security."

At the same time, the President reaffirmed his "serious concern" and opposition to the amendment, designed to make the current interpretation of the treaty binding for the incumbent and any future presidents, which was included in the Senate resolution on ratification of the INF Treaty. The amendment was specially drafted by the Senate Democratic and Republican leaders to prevent a recurrence of the situation with the 1972 ABM Treaty, which the current administration intends to torpedo in fact, refusing to accept the initial interpretation so that to proceed unhindered with the "Star Wars" programme.

Rejecting the amendment, the President alleges in the message that it "can work against the interests of the United States." "Unilateral restrictions on the United States should be avoided, especially in a treaty affecting vital national security interests."

Reagan makes a reservation in his statement saying that the administration's opposition to the amendement would have no practical effect on the implementation of the INF Treaty provisions. He pointed out that the Republican administration had "no intention of changing the interpretation of the INF Treaty", which was set forth in statements by administration witnesses in more than 70 formal hearings in the Senate, and in written answers to over 1,300 questions from the committees and senators. "I believe," Reagan said in the message, "the executive branch and the Senate have a very good common understanding of the terms of the treaty, and I believe that we will handle any question of interpretation that may arise in a spirit of mutual accommodation and respect."

Replying to the President's message, Senate Democratic Majority Leader Robert Byrd stressed that the need to adopt that amendment was prompted by concern over the possibility of a different interpretation of the treaty by any future president, which would run counter to the common understanding existing between the executive branch and the Senate at the moment of ratification. The President accepted that condition when he exchanged instruments of ratification, the senator said. Chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services Sam Nunn, who played an important role in drafting the amendment, also opposed the President's statement. The treaty, including the amendment, has become law now and the President cannot change it by his message, Nunn said.

Shultz 'Disappointed' by Mideast Plan Reactions

LD1206173988 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 12 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] There are quite a few unsolved problems left in the world. One of them is the Near East. It is called a dead end, since the measures undertaken to solve it have so far come to nothing. So what is the way out of this dead end? Our correspondent in Egypt reports:

[Kim Gerasimov, identified from screen caption] The capital of Egypt, Cairo, from ancient times the crossroads of Near East diplomacy, in the last few days has again become the site of lively diplomatic contacts connected with solving the Near East problem. Here you can see the U.S. secretary of state at a news conference in the Cairo Heliopolis Sheraton Hotel after the conclusion of a number of talks in Egypt, Jordan, Syria, and Israel. Both the Arabs and Israel, he admits, are still refusing to support his plan. Shultz is disappointed. Journalists have already learned that during his trip, Shultz sharply condemned Israel's policy on the occupied territories, calling it, in particular, a dead end road.

So perhaps the United States is finally ready to adopt a more decisive position toward Israel? Alas, no. The secretary of state opposes both the participation of the PLO in an international conference and the creation of an independent Palestinian state. Is there anything to be surprised about in the fact that the Arabs still have no faith in the Shultz plan?

As for the Soviet position on the Near East, this position, which is close in spirit to the position of the majority of Arab countries, is well known and highly valued here.

Dobrynin Receives AP President Boccardi

LD0806224788 Moscow TASS in English 1715 GMT 8 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 8 TASS—Today Anatoliy Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received Louis Boccardi, president and general manager of the ASSOCIATED PRESS (AP) News Agency.

Matters concerning the role of the two countries' media in fostering better mutual understanding between the Soviet and American peoples, particularly in the light of the recently-concluded Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, were discussed.

Mr Boccardi showed a great interest in the course of and prospects for perestroyka (restructuring) in the Soviet Union, including that from the viewpoint of preparation for the 19th all-union party conference. He was given appropriate explanations.

Murakhovskiy Receives President of U.S. Company

LD0906012988 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2140 GMT 7 Jun 88

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Comrade Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR and chairman of the USSR State Agroindustrial Committee, on 7 June

received Keough, president of the Coca Cola Company. There was a review of the results of cooperation, and specific ways of expanding mutually advantageous economic links were outlined.

RSFSR Delegation Ends Visit to Illinois

LD1006152388 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2015 GMT 9 Jun 88

[Text] Washington, 10 Jun (TASS)—The visit of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet delegation, headed by A.N. Gerasimov, member of the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and first secretary of the Leningrad Gorkom, to the United States is over. The Soviet parliamentarians were in the United States at the invitation of the Illinois state legislature, whose delegation will pay a return visit to the USSR later this year.

Meetings took place in the U.S. capital between the RSFSR Supreme Soviet deputies and Robert Dole, Senate Republican leader, Senators Alan Dixon and Paul Simon from Illinois; Senator Edward Kennedy; Dan Rostenkowski, chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation; and other legislators. A meeting also took place in Washington between the delegation and members of the National Association of State Legislative Assemblies.

Earlier the delegation visited Springfield, the administrative centre of Illinois, where it met Governor James Thompson, the leaders of both houses of the state legislature, and visited other towns in Illinois where it chatted with representatives of business and academic circles.

During the conversations in the U.S. capital, there was active discussion of the results of the Moscow summit between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and President Ronald Reagan, of the policy of glasnost and restructuring, and the forthcoming all-union party conference. Positively assessing the changes in relations between the two superpowers, the U.S. legislators, businessmen, and scientists expressed the hope that this process of improving and developing these relations would continue.

The delegation left for home on Thursday, 9 June.

Further on Soviet Workers Denied U.S. Visas

PM1006151888 Moscow TRUD in Russian 2 Jun 88 p 4

[I. Bryantsev report: "Words and Deeds"]

[Text] A group of Soviet working people was due to fly to the United States yesterday at the invitation of the American workers' newspaper LABOR TODAY, as well as the Coordinating Committee for Labor Union Actions and Democracy. As our newspaper has already reported (see TRUD for 31 May), the U.S. State Department once again delayed issuing visas to a delegation of Soviet working people. The American authorities declared the need for clarifications, which supposedly had to be made at the U.S. Embassy in Moscow. The "clarifications" took place, and time passed. Then, in the end, on 1 June, sewing machine operator L. Sharova, a tool maker at the Lenin Komsomol Truck Plant N. Makhinika, and English language teacher T. Lyashchenko were told that they had been... refused visas.

And that happened at a time when U.S. President R. Reagan is speaking in Moscow about the importance of intercourse between our peoples and of strengthening trust and mutual understanding.

Unfortunately, one cannot help seeing that official Washington's words diverge from its deeds, not for the first time. The story of the visas is just another example of this.

U.S. Paper Views CIA Involvement in Irangate

LD1306084888 Moscow TASS in English 0738 GMT 13 Jun 88

[Text] Washington June 13 TASS—Former high-ranking CIA officials George Cave and Charles Allen presented the first coherent narrative of the secret Iran contra operation in 1985-1986, writes the newspaper THE WASHINGTON POST. All details, the newspaper comments, are known only to a handful of American legislators, who heard Cave and Allen giving testimony behind closed doors last year during hearings in the special commissions of the Congress investigating the "Irangate" affair. However, some moments, shedding light, in particular, on the CIA role in the scandal, were made public recently after part of their testimony was made public.

Richard Allen, put by then CIA director William Casey in charge of counterterrorism, told the legislators, for example, that in September 1985 one of the main figures in the Iran contra operation, former National Security Council aide Oliver North, asked him to direct the National Security Agency to collect electronic intelligence on several Iranian arms dealers, including one named Ascari. It was later established, the newspaper writes, that it was the alias of Manucher Ghorbanifar who was chosen as an intermediary in arms supplies to Iran by the National Security Council on advice from intelligence agencies.

The testimony by Cave, who worked in close contact with Allen and North, indicates that the CIA was directly involved in organising a secret meeting between Iranian and American representatives in September 1986, who discussed exchanging American hostages for arms. Besides, it was suggested that an Iranian-U.S. commission be set up to work in secret on "gradual normalization of relations between the two countries."

Cave's and Allen's testimony, THE WASHINGTON POST stresses, also prove that the CIA was fully aware of an operation being prepared to divert proceeds from the arms deal with Iran to the Nicaraguan contras.

Allen, in particular, told then CIA Director William Casey specifically about it in October 1986, a month before President Reagan and his closest advisers alleged that they first learned of it.

'International Diary' Views Moscow Summit

LD1006103488 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 9 Jun 88

[From the "International Diary" program, presented by All-Union Radio commentator Sergey Pravdin, with TASS political observer Yuriy Kornilov]

[Text] [Pravdin] The Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Moscow remains at the focus of attention of the international public and press. It is being carefully studied and analyzed in governments, parliaments, headquarters of political parties, and newspaper editorial offices. The Soviet public is convinced: All 5 days of the summit figure in this year's political calendar as its most important and memorable pages.

At the same time, as the letters show, a number of our listeners also have a range of questions. Here, for example, Nikolay Nikolayevich Vishnyakov from Moscow writes in his letter: The previous Soviet-U.S. summit meeting which took place in Washington last December was crowned with a truly sensational success; the signing of the treaty eliminating two classes of nuclear weapons at once, intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. No documents of equal significance were signed at the present summit. Would it thus be justified, the author of the letter asks, to put this summit in terms of its significance on a par with the Washington summit? And the second question: Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed repeatedly the importance of strengthening trust between the USSR and the United States. What are the roads leading to that objective, the strengthening of trust? Yuriy Emmanuilovich, over to you.

[Kornilov] To start with, I would like to draw the attention of Nikolay Nikolayevich Vishnyakov and other listeners one more time to the fact that the outcome of the Moscow summit talks has been received with approval by many major political, public figures of a wide range of countries. That summit, the joint Soviet-U.S. statement, have been welcomed in their speeches and statements by UN Secretary General De Cuellar, by leaders of the fraternal socialist states, British Prime Minister Thatcher, French President Mitterrand, FRG Chancellor Kohl, Japanese Prime Minister Takeshito, Finnish President Koivisto, Argentine President Alfonsin; Mugabe, president of Zimbabwe and also chairman of the Nonaligned Movement. That list could go on and on.

Of course, the estimates and pronouncements by eminent world politicians do not agree in everything. But they are virtually unanimous about one thing: Noting that the last 3 years saw 27 meetings of the heads of the foreign policy departments of the USSR and the United States, 2 unprecedented—in past experience—meetings between the Soviet and U.S. defense ministers, and, above all, 4 meetings of the leaders of the two states, they remark that these data themselves are convincing proof of the fact that the era of blind confrontation in USSR-U.S. relations is over. It has been replaced by an era of political dialogue which started in Geneva, passed through the tests of Reykjavik, was crowned with its first success in Washington, and has now received a new powerful impulse in Moscow.

That is really so. As was stressed at the 6 June session of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, by laying down a constructive basis for the long-term development of relations between the two countries, the Soviet-U.S. dialogue serves the goal of transferring them to a normal, healthy track, raising their level, their stability, and predictability.

[Pravdin] More than 2 weeks ago, Soviet soldiers and officers in Afghanistan began their journey home, for which they had long been waiting. Continuing to comment on the gradual withdrawal of Soviet troops, much of the world press stresses the international significance of the principle of the Geneva package, which creates incentives and indicates specific ways of extinguishing the flames of conflagrations in various regions of the world. The reflection of these conflagrations can be well observed in Moscow and Washington. It was quite logical that the issue of settling regional conflicts was one of the important subjects on the agenda of the Moscow summit meeting. The joint Soviet-U.S. statement says that although as a result of the discussions that took place serious differences of opinion were revealed in the estimates of both the reasons for regional tensions and the means to overcome them, the leaders agreed that these differing opinions should present no obstacle to constructive cooperation between the USSR and the United States. In the meantime, we know from newspapers that the bloodshed in Afghanistan goes on.

A group of students of the Moscow Tsiolkovskiy Aviation Technology Institute would like to know who, after all, is responsible for that, who tries to impede the process of national reconciliation which is currently underway in Afghanistan. The same question is asked by Comrades Azaryan from Yerevan, Korobko from Kiev, and Vasyukov from Vladivostok.

[Kornilov] The essence, the pivot of the Geneva accords on Afghanistan, is putting an end to interference in Afghan affairs. Pakistan is one of the signatories of these accords, from whose territory such interference was conducted from the very outset of the undeclared war against the Afghan Republic. What is going on today?

The interference in question is not only continuing but has even been intensified. Official Pakistani Government organizations—with support and encouragement from abroad, of course—are intensifying their operations on sending groups of armed opposition and convoys with weapons to Afghanistan. Bases where terrorists are trained, headquarters masterminding hostilities on Afghan soil, and the information and propaganda centers of antigovernment groupings which specialize in fanning anti-Afghan and anti-Soviet fabrications, continue to operate actively. Extremists from the number of irreconcilable elements subject peaceful quarters of Kabul to barbaric shellings, blow up in the streets of the Afghan capital trucks delivered from Pakistan and stuffed with dynamite, and commit bandit attacks on Soviet troops.

[Pravdin] The press reported a few days ago that Pakistani President Ziaul Haq dissolved the government and parliament. Our listeners, including Sergey Adodo from Moscow and Koreyev from Vladivostok, ask if there is a connection between what is happening in Pakistan and Islamabad's stance vis-a-vis the Afghan issue.

[Kornilov] That is both an interesting and an important question. Many foreign observers are also seeking an answer to it. The French LE MONDE, for example, noting that there were differences of opinion on the Afghan issue between Ziaul Haq, who suspended the democratization of Pakistan, and Prime Minister Junejo, whom he deposed, states that the president was far from being such a staunch supporter of the Geneva accords as his former prime minister.

Some other Western media, while discussing the reasons and underlying causes of the events taking place in Pakistan, formulate the question as follows: Could it be the intention of Ziaul Haq who, as reported by the British STATESMAN, himself characterized the Geneva accords a few days ago as a fig-leaf designed allegedly to bring out the fact that the fight for freedom in Afghanistan has not been completed—so, could it be that Ziaul Haq himself intends to dissociate himself openly from the Geneva accords signed by a representative of the government now dissolved by him? And if it is the case and the facts, I repeat, present increasingly conclusive evidence that it is indeed the case, one ought, I think, to say with all possible clarity and certainty: Accords are accords, and the Pakistani president is fully responsible for strict and precise abidance by the Geneva accords which his country signed.

Should the actions of the Pakistani side lead to an actual frustration of these accords, Islamabad must know that the Soviet Union will react to such actions with all possible resolve and in the way dictated by the situation. Kabul's stance is identical, as was stressed by Afghan President Najibullah in his speech at the 7 June session of the UN General Assembly.

[Pravdin] Vera Dmitriyevna Feldman, our constant listener from Moscow, writes: The Moscow summit was held in an unusual period. Large-scale peaceful initiatives of the USSR have snatched from the hands of Western experts on Russia their favorite trump card of the mythical Soviet threat, and the Soviet restructuring deals blow after blow to the worn-out cliches and stereotpyes about the closed and undemocratic nature of Soviet society.

Such a situation is welcomed by the advocates of peace and friends of our country. But this situation is far from being to the liking of those in U.S. circles who are still oriented not toward cooperation but toward confrontation, and they look for ways and methods of scoring propaganda points. That is why they try by speculating primarily on humanitarian issues to place some sort of demands on the USSR, to impose conditions and to submit claims. The Soviet people resolutely refute such speculations. What is the reaction to them abroad?

[Kornilov] The new things which are being increasingly consolidated in the international arena have also left a clear trace here. No matter how hard the foes of socialism tried, they did not succeed in raising another hullabaloo about violations of human rights in the USSR, which has also been acknowledged by many foreign media.

Reagan simply lost touch with life, making critical remarks which would have been justified some time ago but which are outdated now, the British newspaper THE INDEPENDENT writes, for example.

The French newspaper L'HUMANITE, noting that the President during his stay in Moscow apparently did not grasp sufficiently the essence of Soviet restructuring, states that as a result he kind of found himself captive of the postulates on the evil empire designed across the ocean. I would like to meet with dissidents, then I would feel at home in the United States, the U.S. President said in reply to a question of a journalists in Moscow, which was cited by Western newspapers. His wish, as is known, came true. About 40 of them assembled.

But if the President had really wanted to meet back home the people whose rights have been really violated and flouted, these people would have been so numerous that the vast suites and halls of the White House would not have enough room for all of them. After all, among them are not only the 11,000 people who, according to U.S. public organizations, languish in jail as political prisoners. Among them are also hundreds of thousands of U.S. citizens deprived of such basic human rights as the right to work, housing, education, to say nothing of the thousands and thousands of those who are persecuted and hounded by the authorities for their participation in the antiwar movement and in the struggle against racism.

The Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND and other media are now asking a very good question: Why does the President does not stage propaganda routs with tea parties for U.S. dissidents? Yes, you cannot deny that now the so-called Soviet dissidents not only bring propaganda dividends to Washington, but, as we can see, yield a result that is contrary to that desired.

I can see a future when our countries, claiming no special rights in the world, will be permanently aware of their special responsibility in the community of equal states, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said, speaking at the dinner at the U.S. ambassador's residence on 31 May. The outcome of the Moscow summit meeting bears witness to the fact. This optimism is justified. Of course, the path to such a future cannot be easy or simple. But movement along that path has begun, and the world public hopes and believes that its pace will increase.

'Studio 9' Television Program on Moscow Summit

OW1106062588 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0350 GMT 11 Jun 88

["Studio 9" program, presented by Prof Valentin Zorin, political observer of Soviet Television and Radio, with Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Bessmertnykh, Soviet deputy foreign minister, and Valentin Mikhaylovich Falin, NOVOSTI chairman of the board and doctor of historical sciences]

[Text] [Zorin] Hello, comrades. We want to dedicate today's talk in Studio 9 at the Ostankino Television Center to the recently completed Soviet-U.S. summit. Mail addressed to Studio 9 attests to the fact that, now that a number of days have elapsed, our viewers, who generally speaking, are people aware of, and who follow, international events, would like to hear more profound answers to questions of interest and to receive new information. Therefore, we have invited people to participate in our talk who have had the opportunity to observe the summit process from a close vantage point. They are Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Bessmertnykh, Soviet deputy foreign minister, who took part in the talks, and had the opportunity to observe the proceedings at close quarters; and Valentin Mikhaylovich Falin, chairman of the board of NOVOSTI and doctor of historical sciences.

I think our audience is aware from our press that, during the days following the summit, different evaluations of the summit have emerged in the West and that there are shades of these evaluations. Therefore, I would like to start our talk with what today's participants today think about the results—the actual results—of the summit, about what yardstick should be applied in measuring the success or failure of such a meeting. Valentin Mikhaylovich, what would you say to this?

[Falin] It has been often said that time is needed before an event is properly assessed, so that there is some distance between us and the event. We cannot rest. The summit participants have entrusted delegates to continue with talks on most important issues. I think it would be more correct, in assessing the summit, to pose the following questions: What have we arrived at? What did we begin with? What was the state of affairs in our relations with the United States at the time we met in Geneva? Some said it was a cold winter; others even said that there was a state of permanent freeze in our relations and, suddenly, the President, leaving Moscow, saying farewell to the general secretary and the Soviet people, used words that, from his lips, are quite unexpected. They were so warm, so apparently sincere, so full of goodwill, that one involuntary thinks: Is this the President we had the honor of greeting in Moscow 5 days ago, or did that President already leave Moscow? All these questions are very important. This is not merely psychology, not merely ethics or diplomacy. Behind these outward appearances, there hides much of importance. That is why I feel this is worth pursuing. The main thing, however, is that the Soviet-U.S. dialogue was given a new, deeper, qualitatively more important, and broader scope. This dialogue allows for the stabilization of Soviet-U.S. relations and, on this more stable basis, with an accumulation of trust, the future prospects are clearer and better seen. This is very important for the solution of those truly vital problems on today's agenda.

[Bessmertnykh] I was intrigued by your thought about the use of a yardstick for measuring important events, particularly one such as a summit. First, I would like to indicate what yardstick one should avoid in order to give a true evaluation of such an important event as the one Valentin Mikhaylovich has been describing. First, it should not be measured by such factors or indicators as sensationalism, some form of documentary assessment of the sum total, and so forth. If we were to take a look at the whole chain of summits over the past 3 years—there have been four—then, in fact, only one resulted in the specific signing of an agreement. Nevertheless, none of us would say that the other three summits were in any way inferior to this one. Each of the summits was a step forward along the path to a certain goal. Because, in order to correctly view the result of the Moscow summit, I think it is important to compare the goals we set and the results achieved. This is most important. Then we ought to view this event from every possible angle. I would propose to, at the very least, peel off three analysis layers. The first relates to the problem of atmosphere. Certainly, the Moscow summit—the whole world is saying this—has brought about a certain calm into international relations as a whole.

Everyone is feeling this. Our people are feeling it, as well as those who live in other countries, not only those who participate in various forums but those people who live in towns and villages as well.

The second layer is that which pertains to the conceptual discoveries and decisions that have been taken at this summit at the level of our General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and U.S. President Reagan.

Because the conclusions they reached at this summit are extraordinarily important, we will no doubt return to them later; they include problems of acceptability, the reality of conducting business with each other, political methods in solving questions, and dialogue as a driving force in USSR-U.S. relations.

Finally, there is the layer of specific agreements. Thank heaven, this time there were many, although we have not spoken about them quite as much. There were specific agreements, including those relating to military and political areas. New agreements were signed: for example, the one about informing each other on the launching of ballistic missiles, as well as six or seven bilateral agreements which are of important significance to our economy and science, contacts between individuals, and so forth. Therefore, the total effect of the summit, its total effect on Soviet-U.S. relations and on the world situation as a whole, provides the answer to your question. Truly, it was a giant step forward in the cause of normalizing the world situation and improving Soviet-U.S. relations—truly, a very significant event.

[Zorin] Nevertheless, those who are attempting to—and there are quite a few such commentators—critically appraise the results of the Moscow summit are saying that there was no agreement, as it was first hoped, on the 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive weapons. Does this fact, that an agreement was not reached in Moscow, detract in any way from the value of the summit?

[Bessmertnykh] Unquestionably, the signing of an agreement would have added much to the summit. On the other hand, the absence of an agreement does not detract from the significance of this meeting. This seems like a paradox, but in fact it is not. There were no surprises. During the last ministerial level meetings between Comrade Shevardnadze and George Shultz, it became increasingly clear that an agreement, unfortunately, would not come about. There were a variety of reasons. First, there was the fact that the American side dragged its feet and did not facilitate the solution of some of the important questions that were on the negotiating table. However, despite the fact that there was a failure to conclude an agreement on the 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive weapons, nevertheless, an added and very important step toward it was taken. This should be fully understood.

In connection with this, I would like to bring up a few examples. First, if we were to take the draft text of the agreement—it is currently in Geneva and our delegation is studying it thoroughly—there still remain a thousand or so brackets. A bracket means that there has not been an agreement as yet on a certain point. Of the thousand or so brackets, only five or so are key issues. The solution of these would immediately lead to elimination of the remaining brackets. Of these, certainly, the most important one is the question of adherence to the ABM Treaty as it was signed in 1972. The relation between the reduction of strategic offensive weapons and the treaty is self-evident, and everyone knows it. By the way, the Americans are also fully aware of it. Second, there is the question of sea-launched cruise missiles; indeed, it is a difficult issue to solve. Third, there is the issue of air-launched cruise missiles and how they should be taken into consideration and how this question is to be resolved. The fourth issue concerns mobile, intercontinental ballistic missiles. Finally, the fifth is the rather broad issue of verification measures, how to work them out, and following this, how to implement these measures. These are the five key issues. I would say that four of these are already within sight of solution. The one that remains is the question of air-launched cruise missiles and how to take stock of them. The question of mobile intercontinental ballistic missiles is, for all practical purposes, being solved very rapidly. The issue of verification has been enriched, and progress is even being made in the area of the ABM Treaty. At least we now know how to go about it. We have worked out a blueprint for further work, and we already have a draft ABM agreement. The issue of sea-launched cruise missiles is the one immovable problem remaining. Here, the Americans have really applied the brakes. If progress had been made on this question, I feel we could have reached agreement on the reduction of strategic offensive weapons in May. Thus, a very important step forward has been made.

[Zorin] It seems to me that here there is—you may not agree with me, I do not know—but it seems there are various reasons here hindering the removal of these brackets that you spoke about. But, I would like to say that the present moment is special. These talks were held at a time when the election campaign was in full swing. They were held in the concluding period of the outgoing President's activities. Allow me to say that the slowdown you spoke about is also linked to the election campaign. What do I have in mind? Well, I do not think that any of the possible White House successors to the current President is very eager to present such a gift as the conclusion of an historic treaty to an outgoing President. Every one of them would probably like to sign such a treaty himself. Moreover, since Reagan will not leave a very brilliant legacy to his successor, particularly in the economic sphere, the President's successor is sure to be interested in balancing existing difficulties with some successes, and therefore, they do not want to rush the issue of speeding up the talks in Geneva.

However the traditions and regulations of the U.S. State Department system are such that representatives of this system are the negotiators in Geneva. And possibly today they are already looking not so much to an active but outgoing President who will step down in just over 6 months; they might want to curry favor with the man who will replace him. The fact that the Moscow meeting failed to coordinate a draft, to remove the brackets that you mentioned, could to some degree—if not completely, then to some degree—be related to these internal political considerations in the United States.

Now, I understand that the whole business cannot be explained this way, and so, Valentin Mikhaylovich, I would like to ask you the following questions: How can one explain in general the sluggishness, inconsistencies and contradictions in the activities of the Washington administration? Just take a look: The Geneva summit resulted in a statement that there cannot be a nuclear war. It would seem that definite conclusions would stem from a statement such as this. But it is impossible to say that after this statement the Washington administration has acted rapidly and consistently in this direction. What is the problem?

[Falin] First of all, I would only partly agree with your thesis that the election struggle is having a considerable or decisive influence on the talks and their speed. It does have an influence, but we should also not overestimate it.

Second, we should keep in mind that the illogical, inconsistent, and zigzag nature of the American line at the talks on this entire parcel of questions was manifested long before the election struggle entered its active phase. The reason for this, I believe, is the fact that so far, people who make U.S. policy—not only the President but also the entire structure on which U.S. Presidents lean, including the military-industrial and other complexes that play the corresponding fiddle or other instrument in the American military and political orchestra—they have so far not determined their aim nor their interests in many issues on which the depth of disarmament depends, even as the Americans themselves have begun saying more often, arms control. What I think is particularly important is the influence of decisions already adopted and those that await adoption on U.S. military concepts and doctrines.

There are reports that the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff have not yet arrived at a unanimous conclusion on the concrete consequences to U.S. military doctrine of a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms. Now, if there is no clarity here, then it is obvious why there is no clarity, precision, and consistency in the the positions of U.S. delegates at the talks. If the secretary of defense declares that the Soviet Union is the enemy—he actually said this a few days before the President arrived in Moscow, and as a matter of fact, Carlucci accompanied the President—and if he repeats the same thought right after Moscow, even if in somewhat softer terms, and if thinking proceeds in the framework of the understanding that the enemy is not an enemy, but the enemy is a friend [vrag ne vrag, vrag drug], then it appears to me that here we must state, for the sake of objectivity, that for the United States, for Washington, it is still a long way to a new thinking without which it is difficult to imagine a new and far-reaching policy, particularly on questions of security.

I would like to draw attention to the following: The Americans say that they will not change, that they have always been right. They even say that the United States makes no apologies for its foreign policy—this administration has such a tenet. They say that by acting from a position of strength, they encourage the other side to change for the better. They believe in this. They sometimes believe in it so much that it cuts the very ground from under their feet. As Pushkin said, falsehoods that ennoble us are dearer to us than a multitude of lowly truths.

Yes, the desire to live in a world that appears to be cozy and comfortable, and most important of all, which does not force one to do more than the bare minimum, is an American tradition. Here we must help the Americans; we must help them understand the genuine value of reality and the genuine danger of a lack of respect for reality, regardless of the state of our bilateral relations. As a result of material changes in the development of mankind, factors have arisen that are equally imperative to both of us and to everyone else. These factors are higher than previous ideas; they refute previous ideas or the value of previous ideas insofar as today, the question of mankind's survival is the key issue, the survival of the Soviet Union and the American State as part of civilization.

We have become indispensable to one another. Although we argue, disagree, and criticize one another, we need each other. It is essential that we find a common language in order to establish conditions for the continuity of the human race, or for our own continuity.

[Bessmertnykh] You mentioned that they would or would not like to make a present to the incumbent President, having in mind the aspirants to the White House, the current candidates. In other words, you have Bush and Dukakis in mind.

[Falin] Yes.

[Bessmertnykh] Well, with all due respect, Valentin Sergeyevich, I too only partly agree with you. I do not think they can consider giving or not giving Reagan a present insofar as they simply do not have anything tucked away. With all due respect, neither the representative of the Democratic Party nor the representative of the Republican Party, Dukakis or Bush, can have such a serious influence on the administration's policy: although to some extent, I do agree that they are backed by forces—but as individuals they really do not have such opportunities at their disposal—and these forces that stand behind them hinder this.

Here I would like to simply express another idea in addition to what Valentin Mikhaylovich has said. After all, we are dealing with a conservative administration, with the most conservative administration ever to be in the White House. Obviously, the forces that pushed it to the forefront of the political stage have absolutely no desire to see the development of such a powerful trend toward disarmament that would result from such a rapid second treaty within 6 months of the Treaty on the

Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, from the achievement within 6 months of a treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms, a trend that would be impossible to restrain and which would take off by itself. Why, in the blink of an eye, we could have universal nuclear disarmament! This frightens the circles that stand behind this White House.

At the same time, nevertheless, I would recognize the President's credibility [dat kredit doveriya]. In other words, from the talks, from the contacts that occurred before these talks, and through personal contacts with our General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, from all this it can be felt that the President has understood—albeit towards the end of his Presidential career—that a reduction of strategic arms and nuclear arms is beneficial to the United States. This is a fact. There are some in his entourage who also support him in this but, unfortunately, not everyone.

[Falin] Is there a readiness to draw conclusions from the following package: There should be no nuclear war; there will be no victor in a nuclear war; nuclear arms are immoral; and they should be destroyed? We declared—Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's 15 January 1986 statement and then the Reykjavik proposal—that we are prepared to pursue this path, and very quickly, by 1996. Having said A, the United States has not been prepared to say either B, C, or D, and so forth. This is the problem. As this problem is not clear, we will of course have to grind out our de facto position with great difficulty because there can be no coincidence in some specific tasks that must be solved.

[Zorin] I would like to ask you, Aleksandr Aleksandrovich, to answer some of the questions posed in the letters which we have been receiving lately, even though you have already answered them in part. Even so, our viewers want to know what was not seen, the things that took place behind the scenes, the things that were specifically agreed on, and the issues on which no agreement was reached.

[Bessmertnykh] I think that this summit was one of the most open meetings ever. That is, our Soviet people and the foreign public saw almost everything. Nevertheless, the whole mechanism remains interesting and complicated. Mikhail Sergeyevich conducted talks with Reagan literally from day one; within 45 minutes of Reagan's arrival in the Kremlin, there was a private meeting. It was very interesting. Our leaders summed up the results of various attempts over recent years by Soviet and U.S. leaders to interact on the main issues of Soviet-U.S. relations and world problems. This attempt to sum things up was a result of the whole post-Geneva period you spoke about. This is very important from the viewpoint of accumulating experience to conduct business both with this administration—and we do intend to do further business with it while it remains in the White House—and with future administrations which will come to power. Obviously, one cannot recount the entire event, but perhaps the episodes of interest are the ones that Mikhail Sergeyevich spoke of briefly...

[Zorin, interrupting] I wanted to ask about that; you mean at the news conference?

[Bessmertnykh] Yes. At the news conference, he twice referred to them—also, while speaking to the representatives of the world public.

[Zorin] He said, at the very last minute...

[Bessmertnykh, interrupting] As they say in Russian, they had a violent clash [stenka na stenku]. A sharp argument ensued.

[Zorin] What was it about?

[Bessmertnykh] I think that this talk, so to speak, was the crowning moment of the meeting. Although, as Mikhail Sergeyevich later said, it was truncated; it was, nevertheless, of great significance. What we are speaking about is that our general secretary offered to prepare a platform and state it in a joint document which would provide our people and others with the prospect of seeing the further development of our relations: that is, to state a platform of possibilities and political actions for the future. At the same time, he logically referred to Geneva, the first summit meeting, at the end of which a statement was made on certain military and strategic principles, to which you have already referred: There can be no victor in a nuclear war; it should never take place; there must never be a nuclear or conventional war between the Soviet Union and the United States; neither country should aspire for arms superiority; and so forth. Mikhail Sergeyevich proposed: Why can't we, right now, on the basis of experiences gained through the four summit meetings, formulate a joint platform which would state such generally accepted norms as: Differences must be resolved through peaceful and non-military means. This is a direct political conclusion that stems from the concepts approved in Geneva; peaceful coexistence is the universal principle of people and states; everyone has the right to a political choice in social and economic spheres.

These strong, clear positions were offered to the President so that they could be jointly stated in a final document. The President immediately agreed. He said that he liked it, but he said, let us give it to the experts. But, as it happens, experts do not always make matters easier, at least, not all the experts. Therefore, when the last round of talks began in the Kremlin between Reagan and the general secretary, Mikhail Sergeyevich raised the question: What is your reaction to my proposal in this regard? Here is where the interesting discussion took place, first at the negotiating table. Mikhail Sergeyevich said: I see that you are not in agreement with each other. The President says one thing; George Shultz says something else; Carlucci says yet something else; Powell and

Ridgeway say something else again. Maybe you should get together and consult amongst yourselves on the viewpoint you will accept. The delegates then parted. This took place in the Yekaterininskiy Hall. The American delegation went off to one corner, and the Soviet delegation retired to the opposite corner to give them an opportunity to consult with each other in private. After a while, they all got together again, and the discussion proceeded with the participants standing. After some tortuous talk, Reagan said: Mr General Secretary, unfortunately we cannot.

Our side presented arguments. We asked: Why the refusal? All right, we said, you do not agree with the concept of peaceful coexistence; let us put it differently. The people of the world are saying that there is a need to live in peace with each other. Are you against this? Perhaps you are against the right of people to social and economic self-determination or perhaps you are against the peaceful solution of disagreements. What is the matter? It goes without saying that the American delegation felt decidedly uncomfortable. Shultz said that they were uncomfortable with statements such as these and, therefore, requested that the matter be postponed for the time being.

Mikhail Sergeyevich then said: Well, we have stopped halfway through, but do give the matter some thought because this is truly a strong platform. If states as powerful as the USSR and the United States make public these future norms of behavior, then certainly it will create good, confident opportunities for normal development of events in world politics. This is one of the interesting episodes, and I think that although this discussion was not completed and was not expressed as a document, the mere fact that it took place, that people who formulate U.S. policies were present, will have great significance.

[Zorin] In this connection, I have a question for you as a person who saw it all from the inside. You have touched on it. What was Reagan's team like, and how was the work organized during the meeting?

[Bessmertnykh] Well, Reagan's team was well known to us. Valentin Mikhaylovich already spoke about one member of the team, Carlucci—by the way, an interesting metamorphosis. When Carlucci was in the White House as the President's national security adviser, Shultz brought him along regularly to talks, be they in Washington, Moscow, or Geneva. On the whole, he was a man of balanced views, at least in terms of what he said about Soviet-U.S. relations. When he went over to the Pentagon and became the secretary of defense, he became a totally different Carlucci. In one of the discussions, one of our representatives said to him: See how the position spoils the man. But on the whole, this is a man who is very experienced. He is also the former chief of the CIA [title as heard].

[Falin, interrupting] It is a means of transportation. If we were to place a doctor in a tank, he too would start to think differently.

[Bessmertnykh] Shultz is undoubtedly a figure who plays a serious role in world politics. They are all conservatives; he is, too. However, he is perhaps the most realistic in his appraisals of U.S. capabilities, which is very important for American politicians. As a rule, they do not have the ability to correctly assess their own capabilities and tend to exaggerate them. The same applies to his appraisal of the Soviet Union. Americans, as a rule, attempt to understate Soviet capabilities. Shultz, I feel, was able, to a large extent, to capture the balance of our interests, which no doubt was helpful. Powell, the current national security adviser, a three star Army general, is apparently more capable as a diplomat then a general. He has a soft, thoughtful appearance, and this seems to have appealed to the current President. He seems to be above party and politics. By the way, no one seems to know whether he belongs to the Democratic or the Republican Party. It seems that for this position, party affiliation is of no importance. More than that, it is important that no one knows about it. Howard Baker, the current White House chief of staff, is a man of much experience. He is a former leading senator who, not long ago, entertained presidential ambitions but now seems to have renounced them. Nevertheless, it seems that he will continue to play a serious role. By all appearances, he exerts consequential influence on the President. As far as a professional diplomat like Ridgeway, U.S. assistant secretary of state for Europe and the Soviet Union [title as heard], is concerned, she is a diplomat with broad experience, and she was responsible for most of the work of drawing up joint documents. So, ideologically, the team was much as expected. It was conservative, highly professional, and pragmatic as a whole. A team which certainly gave support to the President at the talks, particularly in the Kremlin—I cannot say how they acted during discussions in the White House. Therefore, it could be said that Reagan leaned on a very strong team. The Soviet delegation had a worthy opponent, and, therefore, the discussions were profound and interesting.

[Falin] In the interest of reaching an agreement, perhaps a worthy partner is a better choice of words.

[Zorin] I would like to pose a question. Perhaps you will find it somewhat blunt, but it is on the minds of many. That is why I feel justified asking it.

Is there any sense in holding talks with a President that has only some 6 months or so left to act as President? Are these talks likely to yield results? From this, the question of continuity arises, a question which is prompted by U.S. political practice. We know that when the current administration came to power in the United States, it showed little respect for many important agreements reached by its predecessors. In your opinion, what is the

state of affairs in regards to continuity, in particular on Soviet-U.S. relations, keeping in mind that in a relatively short time, we will have to deal with a new administration?

[Falin] Valentin Sergeyevich, you have touched on one of the most important aspects. I think that the Moscow meeting is of such extraordinary significance that this meeting stands out from all other meetings, not only with this President but with all other U.S. Presidents as well. In particular, this meeting took place in an election year which traditionally does not feature as a year of dialogue with the Americans and to some extent is not traditionally known for constructive U.S. foreign policy. Much as we would like to, and I would think that it is unavoidable if we think in terms of stable, consistently developing relations which do not encounter periodic backsliding, we cannot avoid thinking about how to prevent situations in which out of a 4-year term of any American presidency—if it is a new president—a year is wasted on him taking over. and the last year is wasted because he begins to conduct the election campaign. For all intents and purposes, only 2 productive years remain. Problems do not wait for elections to take place or for the president to become familiar with the business of his predecessor.

If this is the case, then the Americans themselves must think about it, and everyone, including us, must help them. In this regard, we cannot adjust the world to our own liking; instead, we should draw realistic, contemporary, and very dynamic world conclusions consistent to our position and policies. In this sense, what Aleksandr Aleksandrovich talked about the need to ensure continuity and the particular stress made by the general secretary on the need to hold talks with the administration to the very end, irrespective of what is happening inside the country—as far as possible, that is—this, I feel, also bears witness to new thinking in Soviet foreign policy, a new, more responsible, more mature, more far-reaching approach which speaks of the fact that we are seriously working without any hesitation toward improving long-term relations with all countries, especially with such large countries as the United States, and that we do not intend to play games.

As far as the possible positions of Reagan's successors are concerned, I feel that the statements made by George Bush and Dukakis are very interesting and worthy of note. They are attempting to take over all that is positive and which is on display in Soviet-U.S. relations and to draw the attention of the voters and apparently to attract them on election day. Not only are they ready to support these positive aspects but also to accelerate the pace of the talks, to speed up the pace of decisionmaking, to broaden the list of problems that are discussed today. For example, Dukakis has on many occasions talked about the need to pay greater attention to conventional weapons. There are other clear statements made by Dukakis about the need to adhere to the ABM Treaty in the form that was signed in 1972. He even speaks about his disagreement with the American SDI concepts. He says many other things that are also interesting. By the way, this also makes this U.S. election campaign, under the influence of changes that are taking place in the world and in our relations with this country, different from other elections that we are familiar with. This is very important. It is extraordinarily important.

Finally, I do not want our audience and viewers to develop the impression that we were rushing events and were seeking any agreement with the United States, as long as there was an agreement, particularly on such matters as strategic offensive weapons. We base our agreements with the United States not on numbers but on quality. This is very important. While we demand very profound measures of verification, we do not wish to give satisfaction to previous U.S. views—by the way, they are starting to retreat from this position—that agreements must be guaranteed by all national, international, and other measures of verification. We simply do not need bad treaties. In this context, I do not want to miss the opportunity to emphasize that even if the Moscow meeting ended only with activating the INF Treaty, even in this case, it would have been fully justified because all of us were witness to an historic act. It was the first act in nuclear disarmament, the first act from which there will perhaps be a new chapter—or as Thatcher states, a new volume—in the history of human civilization.

[Zorin] Aleksandr Aleksandrovich, I would like to ask you the following question. You directly took part in all four meetings. You worked in Geneva, you worked in Reykjavik, you worked in Washington, and you worked in Moscow. You have had the opportunity to compare all the meetings. From your viewpoint as a direct participant in the work of these meetings, what was the specific character and peculiarity of the Moscow meeting?

[Bessmertnykh] First of all, one must remember that this was but a link in a chain of very important events. Therefore, I would rather not stress its specific character or different peculiarities. Instead, it would be better to emphasize its continuity in this entire process that began in Geneva.

Nevertheless, this was a meeting that added to and elevated our dialogue, as Mikhail Sergeyevich said, by one or two rungs. This was indeed so because this time, this meeting brought one of the most important treaties of our time into action. This is really the first thing that comes to mind when one wants to single this meeting out from all the others. A real reduction of nuclear arms has begun for the first time in the history of the nuclear age.

Second, the dialogue itself that was held this time was characterized by the broad range of problems that it covered and encompassed and the depth of the analyses of questions discussed. After all, if we look at the documents that resulted and at the news conference held by the CPSU general secretary and the American President, then it can be seen by the nature of the questions

alone how important this event was in itself. One must add that before the Moscow meeting, there were three prior meetings that gave us very extensive experience in cooperation between the leadership of the two countries. Personal contacts between our two leaders strengthened.

In this connection, I would like to partly dwell on the question that you asked earlier, Valentin Mikhaylovich, about whether or not we should have dealt with this President, mainly since he is leaving the political arena. It is quite true that we are not building our policy on consideration of some internal vacillation or internal political situation in the United States. Our state cannot permit itself something like this in such a major matter as relations with the United States and could never do this. Our policy is simply honest, and in our relations with this President and this administration, we are showing how we will pursue matters with other presidents and other administrations.

Of course, we should not entirely rule out the fact that there are problems in the transfer of power in the United States: all the difficulties during the transfer of power from Ford to Carter, when Carter began to misinterpret the Vladivostok agreements, or when the Reagan administration began to reject the SALT II agreement. There were such problems, and I cannot say they will not arise again. The question, however, lies in what role they will play in our future dealings.

So on the whole, the Moscow meeting was a meeting that maybe for the first time in our relations elevated the problem of continuity to a higher political level—not only continuity. After all, not everything that was done by this administration is worth taking into the future. Therefore, we are speaking about constructive continuity, about a positive continuity—in other words, about a continuity of all those matters that were conducted together with this administration in the last 3 years alone, while the previous 5 years we should leave in the past. Negative experience can also be useful to us but not from the viewpoint of continuity with future administrations.

[Zorin] Valentin Mikhaylovich, I have the following question. The problem of human rights during the Moscow meeting has been extensively peddled and talked about in the world press. Can it be said that during this meeting, this problem arose in a new way and not as it was raised in the past?

[Falin] I think there is every reason to put the question this way. It arose in a new way in many aspects. First of all, permit me to make a comparison, although all comparisons are, nevertheless, relative. When, in our time, we refused to have anything to do with verification, particularly on-site inspection and in-depth verification [glubokaya verefikatsiya] of agreements, then our position appeared most vulnerable and unconvincing. In general, it was incomprehensible why we rejected certain obvious things that have long become part of the fiber and blood of real life. Yet, because of inertia, we continued to say no when we should have said yes long ago.

And so on the human rights issue, we said: Let's talk about it; why not discuss it? We have many questions to ask you. We see quite well and objectively where we have difficulties and where we have shortcomings, and now, within the framework of perestroyka, we are engaged precisely in eliminating these shortcomings ourselves without outside prodding. Let us compare our perceptions; let us see how we have set out our priorities on the human rights issue on what is more important. In our opinion, a person must have life in order to enjoy other rights, and so, together with the United States, we must ensure that man and mankind do not perish. We must ensure the material conditions to implement rights and freedoms about which there is much talk, and so forth.

The fact is that we proposed these problems for discussion to the Americans, not in a rhetorical way but specifically and constructively, but—I think Aleksandr Aleksandrovich will correct me if I am wrong—the United States was not particularly prepared for such a specific and constructive discussion.

[Bessmertnykh] I think Reagan was being prepared to think that he was being awaited here in the Soviet Union as almost some kind of messiah who would bring the Soviet people some kind of truth about human rights. Obviously, he was fed this, and his last speeches in Finland, made in Helsinki on the eve of his visit, showed that he was inclined to think this way. I think that this was one of the big mistakes made by the President on this issue....

[Zorin, interrupting] Of those who prepared him.

[Bessmertnykh] Of those who prepared him, that this was precisely the way it would be. When he came in contact with the real state of affairs—as a matter of fact, he spoke with Mikhail Sergeyevich on this topic twice and very seriously and very deeply—and when he felt that the Soviet Union had something to say for itself, besides, say, something positive and to assess the situation self-critically and to outline the ways being planned to correct the situation, and when our general secretary turned to the President and said, why do you not possess the same ability to be self-critical in relation to the United States, he understood that he had indeed been fed—or he possibly believed in it himself—a formal scenario of how the situation of human rights stands in the Soviet Union.

The Americans have begun to understand only quite recently that this is a two-way street. At first Shultz mentioned this, and then Reagan also admitted it, but they have still not learned one thing. They have not learned to give a real answer to our claims about the human rights situation in the United States. They have so far only promised: Yes, we will study the matter; yes,

undoubtedly; thank you for your concern; it will help us better understand the situation in our country. Of course, we are happy to help improve the human rights situation in the United States, but we want to receive through diplomatic channels and at a political level a clear and precise response on the questions we have raised. These questions are very serious: There are national problems, racial problems, and problems of youth. There is the problem of political prisoners in American jails and the injustice of legal authorities in regard to demonstrators opposing war, coming out against nuclear war, and for peace. After all, they are thrown into jails; they are political prisoners. We want to clear this up.

So this process of discussion has moved into a pragmatic sphere, a review of things. I do not rule out that at some future time the Americans will...

[Falin, interrupting] Run from this topic.

[Bessmertnykh] Evade this discussion because it is becoming bitter for them. Yet we have overcome what Mikhail Sergeyevich has called a shyness and diffidence on this question. We waged a revolution for the rights of man, and these questions are now being posed correctly.

[Zorin] In conclusion, I want to ask you a question: What comes next? What in your opinion will be the immediate as well as the more removed consequences of the Moscow meeting? How would you respond to this question, Valentin Mikhaylovich.

[Falin] I would put it this way, that all four meetings between the general secretary and the President—maybe the Moscow meeting in particular—prepared the objective conditions and prerequisites for transferring Soviet-U.S. relations—and to a known extent, in view of the gravity of these relations, the climate of the world community—into a qualitatively new age. The extent to which these prerequisites are implemented or will not be implemented depends today, as always, from two sides, from both sides, but primarily—and I am not sinning against the truth—from the American side. We have made our choice. Our policy and our position on these questions are predictable. The Americans can calculate what we want, what we will do, and what we would not like to do when we are induced to do it. But unfortunately, one cannot say the same thing about the U.S. position.

There still exist very strong forces and groups that are not sympathetic to changes that have taken place in USSR-U.S. relations since the days of the cold war. Following the break in the cold war, there has been a changeover onto the path of good-neighborliness and mutually beneficial, honest cooperation. These groups are very strong. I will put it in the following way by citing a specific example. Former President Nixon—he is an authoritative person in certain circles—recently published a book entitled "1990: Victory Without War." Allow me to make a very short reference to it. In this book, he writes: Disarmament and pacifism are on the rise today. This might have a deadly influence on the fate of the West.

This is one way of thinking, that of yesteryear. If the United States would, in a sober, objective, and considered analysis, make the transition to the realities of today, then certainly, tomorrow's world would seem so much more attractive to all peoples, including the American people. In the world we knew 5 or a little more years ago, each day brought new worries and concerns.

[Zorin] Aleksandr Aleksandrovich, what would you say?

[Bessmertnykh] I think that USSR-U.S. relations have acquired a serious start. The serious dialogue has a sufficiently solid base, and it continues. There exist objective preconditions for stable continuation of USSR-U.S. relations. The real development of events—I agree with what Valentin Mikhaylovich has said, but there is something more—will depend on the quality of future U.S. leaders. The question of the quality of the U.S. leadership is becoming one of the most important problems in our relations. When I speak about the quality of leadership, I primarily mean its ability to assess and comprehend correctly the objective situation in which the United States and the Soviet-American relations continue to exist; the ability to catch the mood of its own as well as international public, and transform this understanding into politics; and, third, to resist temptations which Americans fall into with such ease, particularly in the international arena, when the so-called position of strength or a stand of strength is considered to be the most attractive stand the U.S. President can take. In other words, realism in its pure sense, realism built on a correct understanding of things, realism that will bring about a rejection of stereotypes, and realism in the understanding of one's own interests and the interests of others. In other words, if the American leadership will, like our leadership, consider the solution of the difficult situation in which we are still in to be the finding of a right balance of interests—this is one of the most important elements of the new thinking—then our relations will continue to develop in a sufficiently smooth way, although we cannot completely rule out the possibility of zigzags. The question is what kind of zigzags will they be and whether these zigzags will take us too far away from the main road leading us to a peaceful and nuclear-free future.

[Zorin] Well, be that as it may, it is quite obvious from what you have said that the Moscow summit was a very serious event, an event having a noticeable influence on the course of political process in the international arena. It appears that it will have long-term consequences.

Our time on the air has run out. I would like to thank you for your participation in our discussion and to thank our viewers for their attention. Thank you, and until we meet again, here in our Studio 9.

China

Joint Economic Committee Meets in Beijing

OW0906125188 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 6 Jun 88

[Station observer Ivanov commentary]

[Text] Dear listeners: The third round of talks on economic, trade, and scientific and technological cooperation between the Soviet Union and China is being held in Beijing. In this connection, station observer Ivanov has the following comment:

First, let me talk a little about this committee. It was formed in accordance with an agreement concluded between the Soviet and Chinese Governments on 28 December 1984. The committee supervises the implementation of various agreements between the two countries on economic, trade, and scientific and technological cooperation and puts forward suggestions and measures for the steady development of such cooperation. According to the agreement, the committee is headed by deputy government heads of the two countries.

In the spring of 1986, the first round of talks of the USSR-China committee in Beijing expressed satisfaction over the fact that cooperation in the economic, trade, scientific and technological fields had been resumed and developed in the 1980's after a long pause. It decided that, on the basis of a long-term trade agreement, trade between the Soviet Union and China would be further developed from 1986 to 1990, and this would include border trade.

In the spring of 1987, the second round of talks was held in Moscow. The meeting pointed out that owing to joint efforts significant progress had been achieved in cooperation between the two countries in various fields. An agreement on Soviet assistance to China in construction work was reached at the meeting, and both sides discussed the new situation in cooperation.

The Soviet Union, in the past as well as now, has constantly sought to expand and deepen cooperation with China in various fields. This is because we realize that both countries face similar tasks in speeding social and economic development. The historical economic relations between the two countries, which are complementary to each other, provide favorable conditions for developing cooperation between the two countries. The 27th Congress of the CPSU in 1986 emphatically pointed out the great potential for cooperation between the Soviet Union and China.

The purpose of the third round of talks of the USSR-China Committee for Economic, Trade, Scientific and Technological Cooperation is to further promote and deepen the development of cooperation between the two countries. For this purpose, a draft agreement was formulated for developing economic and trade relations between the two countries and discussions are being held on formulating an agreement on principles to guide Soviet-Chinese joint ventures.

Of course, as has been mentioned at the committee meeting, there still are some shortcomings, and the potential for expanding cooperation has not been fully tapped. But we can say with full confidence that prospects for developing cooperation between the Soviet Union and China are very promising because such cooperation is in accord with the interests of the Soviet and Chinese people.

Maslyukov on 'Positive' Changes

LD1006140488 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 9 Jun 88

[from the "Vremya" newcast]

[Text] [Unidentified announcer] The third session of the Soviet-Chinese Commission on Economic, Trade, and Scientific and Technical Cooperation has ended in Beijing. Speaking in the House of People's Assemblies in Beijing, Comrade Maslyukov, who heads the Soviet delegation, said in particular:

[Begin Maslyukov recording] Noticeable positive changes are under way in cooperation between the Soviet Union and the PRC. This cannot but arouse profound satisfaction among all Soviet people. Thanks to mutual efforts, an entire complex of bilateral ties and contacts has been brought into action. [end recording]

[Announcer] The development and expansion of these ties and contacts are reflected in the documents which were signed in Beijing. [video shows signing ceremony] Among them is an intergovernmental agreement on the principles of establishment and activity of joint enterprises.

[Begin Tian Jiyun recording in Chinese, fading into superimposed Russian translation] We are satisfied with the agreements achieved at this session, and we are convinced that PRC-Soviet cooperation in economics, trade, science and technology, and in other spheres will become even more dynamic. We are ready to make efforts toward this. [end recording]

Delegation Returns From PRC

PM1006144988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jun 88 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report: "PRC Visit Over"]

[Text] Beijing, 9 Jun—A Soviet governmental delegation headed by Yu.D. Maslyukov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, which took part in the third session of the Soviet-Chinese Commission for Economic, Trade, and Scientific and Technical Cooperation, left Beijing today for home.

The Soviet delegation was seen off at the capital's airport by Tian Jiyun, member of the CPC Central Committee Politburo and vice premier of the PRC State Council, and other officials.

The send-off party included O.A. Troyanovskiy, USSR ambassador to the PRC.

The delegation, headed by Yu.D. Maslyukov, was met at the airport in Moscow by N.V. Talyzin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and other officials.

The welcoming party included Yu Hongliang, PRC ambassador to the USSR.

Beijing Confirms Deng Xiaoping Position Unchanged
OW1206105188 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 10 Jun 88

[Text] The director of the Information Department of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs said at a Beijing news briefing: To my knowledge, Comrade Deng Xiaoping remains the chairman of the Central Military Commission.

He said this when reporters asked him to confirm a rumor that Deng has resigned from the post. The rumor was touched off by Deng's remarks during his meeting with Polish Government leader Messner. Acording to Deng Xiaoping, Zhao Ziyang, who is general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, has in fact already exercised the functions and powers of the chairman of the Central Military Commission.

In its report on the Deng-Messner meeting, AFP concluded that Deng Xiaoping would no longer function as the chairman of the Military Commission of the CPC Central Committee, which is his last, but influential, official position.

PRC Cooperation in Nuclear Disarmament Urged
OW1106031388 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 8 Jun 88

[Alekseyev commentary]

[Text] In accordance with a proposal of the World Peace Council, a world peace wave movement will be held from 9 to 12 June, beginning in Hiroshima and passing through various countries. It will pass through the Soviet Union on 11 June. The main objective of this international movement is to take positive action toward disarmament, primarily nuclear disarmament. In this regard, our station observer Alekseyev has the following comments:

Listeners, it is logical to hold a world peace wave movement coinciding with the opening of the the third special UN General Assembly disarmament conference in New York. People of all countries have pinned great hope on this disarmament conference. They hope that all countries, nuclear powers and otherwise, will take part in this action aimed at military de-escalation.

Actually, great achievements have been made toward this end. The Soviet Union and the United States have completed a treaty for reducing intermediate-range missiles and are preparing for a new, larger-scale treaty to cut 50 percent of their offensive strategic arms. At the recent Soviet-U.S. summit in Moscow, both sides reiterated their willingness to sign such a treaty within a short period. These measures, the Soviet Union holds, are major milestones on the road toward the destruction of all nuclear weapons.

General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Gorbachev pointed out on 15 January 1986 that the question of this task should be resolved before we enter the 21st century. Other socialist countries also hold the same stand. It should be emphasized here that China also stands for the thorough destruction of all categories of nuclear weapons. The socialist countries believe that it is vitally important to end nuclear tests as soon as possible. At the current UN General Assembly special disarmament conference the Warsaw Pact countries present a memorandum on disarmament, pointing out that positive efforts must be made in stages to destroy nuclear arms, thoroughly ban nuclear tests and halt the arms race in space.

There is a more pressing need today than ever before for international action to prompt the solution of these questions. Under such circumstances, it should be pointed out in particular that the Soviet Union believes cooperation with China is of special significance. Concerted action by the two largest socialist countries can become a significant contribution to accelerating the disarmament process.

Comparison of Rogachev Beijing News Conference

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian on 9 June carries in its Morning Edition on page 5 a TASS report on the news conference given by I.A. Rogachev in Beijing. The IZVESTIYA report, entitled "Press Conference in Beijing," has been compared with the Moscow TASS International Service version published in the 8 June Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pages 29-30, and reveals the following variations:

Page 29:

Column one, first paragraph, first sentence reads in IZVESTIYA: "...Beijing, 8 Jun—There was a press conference here by Deputy Foreign...." (changing date, deleteing "today")

Second column, first paragraph, last sentence, reads in IZVESTIYA: "...went on, we did hear the opinion that the Moscow...." (correcting words)

Same column, third paragraph, second sentence, reads in IZVESTIYA: "...Vietnamese troops from Cambodia. A qualitatively new situation has now developed in the process of the Cambodian settlement, he stressed. We welcome this...." (adding words)

Page 30:

First column, third paragraph, fourth sentence, reads in IZVESTIYA: "...to show the 'intransigence' of the position...." (changing "irreconciliability" to "intransigence")

Northeast Asia

Liner Fire Caused by Passenger Safety Violation

LD1006125588 Moscow TASS in English 1232 GMT 10 Jun 88

[Text] Vladivostok June 10 TASS—Last month's fire on board a Soviet liner at the Japanese port of Osaka, in which eleven people were killed, has been caused by a fire safety violation by passengers, a commission of inquiry has established.

The Priamurye was carrying 295 Soviet tourists and 129 crew when the blaze broke out there on the night of May 17. Besides those killed, a total of 35 persons suffered burns and injuries and had to be hospitalized.

"The fire was due to passengers in Cabin 346 using household electric heaters contrary to regulations," inquiry commission chairman Oleg Savin told TASS.

Savin, a Soviet deputy minister of merchant marine, added that the blaze spread quickly as it must have been able to reach some readily inflammable substances such as gas refills for lighters and sprays.

The passengers did not report the fire immediately, but their attempts to put it out on their own failed.

The flames engulfed the captain's bridge and other crew premises, making it impossible to use the ship's communications.

A later questioning of passengers and crew members revealed, however, that in spite of that, most people were evacuated from the liner in just 10 or 15 minutes.

The crew acted selflessly, coping with their duties efficiently in those extreme conditions. While rescuing passengers, the sailors also fought the fire to save the ship. Japanese firemen arrived in 20 to 25 minutes.

Investigators from the Far Eastern public prosecutor's office have conducted an own probe along with the inquiry commission from the Ministry of Merchant Marine since the liner arrived in Vladivostok, and are yet continuing it.

Gorbachev Meets With Japanese Labor Delegates

OW1306024088 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 4 Jun 88

[Excerpts] General Secretary Gorbachev, following the Soviet-U.S. summit, on 2 June met with representatives of various countries' peace movement groups. Among the representatives were some from Japan. We asked them to describe their impressions of the meeting.

Please, first, hear the recording of our interview with Mr Hironoda Okumura, assistant director of the Secretariat of the Federation of Japan Automobobile Workers' Unions, who heads a delegation of automobile-related industries' labor unions:

[Begin Okumura recording] After the summit, General Secretary Gorbachev had a meeting on the subject of peace with foreign visitors and some Soviet citizens. It was known to be the first such talk. About 300 representatives gathered to meet with General Secretary Gorbachev, and we were part of the group. Speaking of impressions, first, I could feel that General Secretary Gorbachev is an outstanding leader. Second, I could see that he is very sincere in pursuing detente. Third, I should note the process of democratization taking place as part of perestroyka. I think the meeting itself represented this democratization. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Next, Mr Hajime Nihondo, chief secretary of the Second Bureau of the (?National Federation of Teachers' Unions), spoke as follows:

[Begin Nihondo recording] I am happy I was given such a rare chance to meet with Mr Gorbachev. If relations between the United States and the Soviet Union continue to stabilize like this, I think it will give a favorable effect to various political and economic world issues. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Last, we shall hear the views of Mr Kakuei Ikeda, Political Department chief of the [word indistinct] Labor Union:

[Begin Ikeda recording] We were here at an historic time, when the two superpowers, the Soviet Union and the United States, talked in pursuit of peace. [passage omitted] I am surprised at the tempo of progress being made in Soviet-U.S. relations, and I am beginning to wonder how it will come to influence future Japanese-Soviet relations. [end recording]

Commentary Views Summit, UN Disarmament Session

OW0906070888 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 3 Jun 88

[Dmitriyev commentary]

[Excerpts] On 31 May, many people in the Soviet Union felt strangely. It was because President Reagan, who had openly branded the Soviet Union as an evil empire, was shown on television affably smiling against the backdrop of a Moscow monastery or other places of interest in the Kremlin.

In answer to journalists' questions, President Reagan said that he no longer regards the Soviet Union as an evil empire. It may be safe to say that this fact alone is not a bad result of his visit to the Soviet Union.

The world situation depends largely on Soviet-U.S. relations. So General Secretary Gorbachev told a news conference that the continuation of dialogue with the United States was the most significant result of the talks.

At all the Soviet-U.S. summit talks held thus far, attention has naturally been focused on the nuclear disarmament issue. It may be no exaggeration to think that the world's opinion evaluated the leaders of the two superpowers by the extent of progress made in this area.

In this sense, the summit regarded as having been most fruitful was the one in Washington at which the INF—intermediate-range nuclear missiles—abolition treaty, the first nuclear arms abolition treaty in history, was signed. [passage omitted]

At the latest talks the two sides signed two important agreements in the area of arms race limitations. One of them, an agreement on prior notification of ICBM and SLBM launches, is aimed at strengthening international stability and confidence. On the other hand, an agreement on joint verification and tests of nuclear explosions can be regarded as one of the phases in the negotiations on nuclear test limitations and notification areas.

Meanwhile, in his speech to the Third UN General Assembly Special Session on Disarmament, which is now in session, Japanese Prime Minister Takeshita spoke of his intention to contribute to verifying nuclear tests and convening an international scholars' conference in Japan.

There may be some who are disappointed by the fact that a treaty on the 50-percent reduction of strategic attack weapons was not signed at the latest summit talks. However, it is not necessary to become a pessimist just because of that. [passage omitted]

Thus, it can be said that the Moscow Soviet-U.S. summit had a desirable impact on the Geneva talks between Soviet and U.S. delegates on the 50-percent reduction of strategic attack weapons. The Soviet leadership believes that it will be possible to improve this treaty during the tenure of the incumbent U.S. Administration—in other words, within this year—if both sides act effectively. [passage omitted]

The Moscow summit became an indispensable phase to the process of nuclear disarmament. The Soviet Union plans to complete the abolition of nuclear arms by the year 2000. The task to completely abolish nuclear arms by 2000 was proposed by General Secretary Gorbachev in his 15 January 1986 statement. The statement contains not only an appeal but also a concrete nuclear disarmament program, which was approved by all countries of the world.

The Soviet Union highly rates the support manifested by the world opinion, particularly the opinion of Japan, which was subject to atomic bomb attacks. Without such support it probably would have been impossible to achieve the result already attained in nuclear disarmament.

For the future of human civilization we wish to look forward to such support in the future, too.

Japanese Friendship Association Founding Marked
OW0906064088 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 4 Jun 88r

[From "Soviet Far East News" program]

[Excerpts] Here is a dispatch from Vladivostok city. First, we will talk about the Nakhodka Chapter of the USSR-Japan Association, which is marking its 25th founding anniversary.

A signboard indicating the Nakhodka Chapter of the USSR-Japan Association hangs at the front of the building in Nakhodka that houses the International Seamen's Club. Moreover, you will find many schools and organizations in the city that have plates indicating that they are group members of the association.

(Alexey Shutorimov), a responsible person of the Nakhodkha International Seamen's Club, states as follows:

[Begin recording in Russian fading into Japanese translation] The Nakhodka Chapter of the USSR-Japan Association has set up, since its founding, its headquarters at our club. As indicated by the club's name, we entertain mainly seamen from foreign countries at our club. Since the start of the club, about 15,000 foreign seamen have visited our club. A large number of these visitors are from our neighbor, Japan. Moreover, delegations from Maizuru, Tsuruga, and Odaru—all sister cities of Nakhodka—are sure to visit us, and students who spend their summer vacations at the Nakhodka camp also visit us. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Many of the ships that belong to the Far Eastern Maritime Transport Bureau are members of this association. Mr (Aleksandr Ilychev) of the Bureau states as follows:

[Begin recording in Russian fading into Japanese translation] There are many examples of our cooperation with Japan. Let me give you one. Summer Olympic Games will be held in Seoul this autumn, and many athletes and members of supporting groups are scheduled to leave for Seoul by ship from Nakhodka. However, there are no large boarding stations for passenger ships in Nakhodka. Since a new station that is under construction now will

not be completed for 3 years, a temporary station will have to be urgently set up for the convenience of passengers. As we need Japan's assistance to complete this project, our friendly relations will play an important role in this case. [passage omitted] [end recording]

In conclusion, we will broadcast remarks by (Valentina Yudavulia), chairwoman of the Nakhodka Chapater of the USSR-Japan Association, on the friendly exchanges with our neighbor, Japan. She states as follows:

[Begin recording in Russian fading into Japanese translation] In the 25 years since its founding, the Nakhodka Chapter of the USSR-Japan Association has developed into a big organization with 22,000 members. During this period, our chapter has consolidated the solidarity of our members and has maintained favorable exchanges with many chapters of various Japanese associations for friendship with the USSR in such cities as Maizuru, Odaru, Sapporo, Osaka, and Kyoto, with the Japan-USSR Friendship Halls and grassroots groups in Sapporo and Wakkanai, and also with [words indistinct] in (Sarahatsu) and (Usutera) Townships. Delegations from various localities and circles of Japan have frequently visited Nakhodka, and delegations from our city have also visited Japan to inspect culture, economy, and business management in our neighbor, Japan.

Furthermore, citizens of Nakhodka, Maizuru, and Odaru have frequently joined in the trip of the Ship of Friendship. It was in 1978 that the first ship of friendship visited Nakhodka. We have now come to engage in these exchanges with greater friendliness and in many more fields and the citizens of Nakhodka have always received our guests from Japan with pleasure. [end recording]

Seoul Summer Olympics Security Plan Viewed

PM1306090188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
6 Jun 88 Second Edition p 6

[Yu. Vladimirov "Rejoinder": "Absurd Explanation"]

[Text] The training of 2,500 superagents from subunits of the South Korean security forces for "sports competitions" began 2 years ago. They train regularly at the Seoul stadium where the Summer Olympics will open 17 September. The exercises are based on practicing the moves of the Korean martial art, and already the "sportsmen" are able to "disarm any aggressor, break a spinal cord with their bare hands, defuse a bomb, and blow up car bombs." That is how a special correspondent of the French weekly L'EXPRESS began his report from the 1988 Olympics capital.

In all, 120,000 South Korean police, soldiers, and plainclothes agents, as well as staffers from the CIA and the Japanese secret services—with which the corresponding South Korean departments have cooperated closely for a long time—are being mobilized to "keep order." Certain targets—the government box in the stadium, for instance—will be covered by television surveillance cameras around the clock. For the athletes, journalists, and tourists it is planned to introduce strict restrictions on movements around the city and lay down timetables for leaving hotels and visiting sports grounds.

The hosts of the 1988 Olympics explain these draconian measures by a desire to avoid possible "acts of terrorism," which, in their words, should be expected from their...northern neighbor—the DPRK. That is why the No Tae-u government has even appealed to the United States to bring into action [zadeystvovat] if necessary the 41,000 servicemen of the U.S. 7th Fleet based in the south of the Korean Peninsula.

This explanation sounds absurd. It is not attacks from the north, but upsurges of popular discontent with the political regime in their own country that the South Korean rulers fear. After all, it is no accident that they decided to close all schools and universities in September and instructed businessmen to give their workers leave and try to send them out of Seoul. The authorities do not want the guests of the 1988 Olympics to witness the excesses committed by the police on the orders of South Korean ruling circles in an attempt to keep the people's masses obedient.

DPRK Foreign Minister Makes Moscow Stopover

PM0906143188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
4 Jun 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Stopover on Way Home"]

[Text] Kim Yong-nam, member of the Workers Party of Korea Central Committee Politburo, deputy premier of the DPRK Administration Council, and DPRK foreign minister, stopped over in Moscow 1-2 June on his way home.

DPRK Government Posts Reshuffled 3 Jun

PM0906144788 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
4 Jun 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Changes in the DPRK Government"]

[Text] Pyongyang, 3 Jun—Directives from the DPRK Central People's Committee were published here today on the abolition of a number of existing committees and ministries, the creation of new committees and ministries, and changes in the makeup of the DPRK Administration Council.

Hong Song-nam, member of the Workers Party of Korea [WPK] Central Committe Politburo and vice premier of the DPRK Administration Council, has been appointed chairman of the State Planning Committee. The previous incumbent of this post—Kim Tal-hyon, vice premier of the DPRK Administration Council—has been confirmed as chairman of the Foreign Economic Affairs Committee. Kim Pok-sin, candidate member of the WPK Central Committee Politburo and vice premier of

the DPRK Administration Council, has been relieved of his duties as chairman of the Foreign Economic Affairs Committee and appointed chairman of the Light Industry Committee.

The Chemical and Light Industry Committee has been turned into the Light Industry Committee and the Ministry of the Chemical Industry. Kim Hwan, vice premier of the DPRK Administration Council, has been appointed minister of the chemical industry.

A Construction Materials Industry Committee and a Ministry of Construction have been set up to replace the Construction and Construction Materials Industry Committee.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Gorbachev Envoy Meets With Leaders on Summit

Received by Cambodia's Heng Samrin

LD1006144088 Moscow TASS in English 1335 GMT 10 Jun 88

[Text] Phnom Penh June 10 TASS—Heng Samrin, general secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Revolutionary Party of Kampuchea, chairman of the State Council of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, received today Boris Chaplin, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR and special representative of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. He informed the Kampuchean leader in detail about the results of the Soviet-American summit meeting and the content of talks between Mikhail Gorbachev and the U.S. President.

Heng Samrin said that the Central Committee of the People's Revolutionary Party of Kampuchea and the Government of the Republic wholeheartedly welcomed and fully supported the results of the recent meeting which was a new step forward on the way to a nuclear-free world. It created more favourable conditions for the improvement of the international situation and the settlement of regional conflicts.

The meeting was attended by Chea Sim, Bou Thang, Say Phuthang and Ney Pena (all members of the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the People's Revolutionary Party of Kampuchea) and Rashit Khamidulin, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the USSR to Kampuchea.

Meets Lao Leaders

LD1106213088 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0652 GMT 11 Jun 88

[Text] Vientiane, 11 Jun (TASS)—Kaysone Phomvihan, general secretary of the LPRP [Lao People's Revolutionary Party] Central Committee and chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, today received USSR deputy foreign minister B.N. Chaplin, special representative of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. K. Phomvihan was briefed on the results of the Moscow meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and U.S. President R. Reagan.

On behalf of the LPRP Central Committee and the Lao government and people, K. Phomvihan hailed the positive results of the Soviet-U.S. summit and voiced his full support. The Lao leader placed high value on constructive continuation of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue, which indeed contributes to improving the international situation and creating favorable conditions for a peaceful settlement of regional conflicts. He expressed his sincere gratitude to the Soviet leadership and to M.S. Gorbachev for his tireless fruitful activity aimed at ensuring a peaceful future for humanity.

Phomvihan stated that the LPRP is determined to contribute its share in ensuring peaceful stability and cooperation in Southeast Asia and the whole world, together with the Soviet Union and the peace-loving people of other countries. An exchange of views took place on a broad range of issues concerning international politics.

Khamtai Siphandon, member of the Politburo, secretary of the LPRP Central Committee, vice chairman of the Council of Ministers, and minister of national defense of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, as well as other Lao officials and Yu. Mikheyev, USSR ambassador to the Lao People's Democratic Republic, also took part in the conversation.

The conversation passed off in an atmosphere of friendship and full mutual understanding.

Western 'Interference' Criticized by Burma

BK1206081888 Moscow in Burmese to Burma 1430 GMT 11 Jun 88

[Aleksandr Vladimirov Commentary: "Who Needs the Unknown War?"]

[Text] Burma has strongly condemned the recent filming of the slanderous documentary, "The Unknown War," on British television. The BOTATAUNG newspaper believes that the film by the BBC was an insult to Burma and was flagrant interference in the internal affairs of that country. Before we go any further, it should first be clarified that the staff of Radio Moscow did not see that film and only learned about it from Western media reports. However, Radio Moscow observer Aleksandr Vladimirov says that the information in hand is sufficient enough for him to make the following comments:

"The Undeclared War" tries to portray the KNU [Karen National Union] rebels as comrades-in-arms struggling for the rights of the ethnic minorities. But the Burmese people know very well that these rebels have committed innumerable bloody crimes. The KNU, operating behind

a facade of racial slogans, has actually become an underground gang enriching itself through the smuggling of gems and precious stones, teak, currencies, and antiques. This is common knowledge in Burma, and I, as a one-time resident of that country, also know about this very well.

There is a certain angle that we should particularly dwell upon at this stage. "The Undeclared War" is not an isolated case of smear campaign against the Socialist Republic of the Union of Burma in recent months. For instance, only recently Amnesty International presented a false report about human rights violations in Burma. The special report of that organization implied those violations in reporting about the Burmese Government's campaign against violent armed elements at the border areas. Moreover, an article by an American columnist, [name indistinct], in the FAR EASTERN ECONOMIC REVIEW also reported a similar theme. On previous occasions also, the columnist has interpreted Burmese events in a way that would serve his interests.

It would be a mere waste of time for this commentary to refute every single point of what has been said in those publications. But what we should consider is: Who are the ones behind the smear campaign and propaganda against an independent and self-reliant Burma? Today, Burma has reached a complicated and difficult phase of its development plan. It is a phase when the Burmese leadership will have to decide how to overcome the obstacles hampering national economic development.

So far, the Burmese people have chosen a way which makes them the least dependent on foreign monopoly companies. Only decisions made on the basis of self-reliance can guarantee economic and political independence. But such a choice is not liked by everyone. Such a propaganda campaign by the Western nations, therefore, raises a question on whether Burma's international standing is deliberately being weakened to make way for foreign powers to directly interfere in that country.

Near East & South Asia

Further Reportage on Afghan Accord 'Violations'

Pogodin Accuses Pakistan

LD0906230888 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 9 Jun 88

[Text] In a note handed to Pakistan, the Soviet Union says the Pakistani side has continued to flagrantly violate the commitments undertaken under the Geneva accords to bring about a settlement in Afghanistan. Radio Moscow's Aleksandr Pogodin comments:

Almost a month after the Geneva accords came into force on 15th May, the state of affairs for the implementation appears abnormal indeed. On the one hand, the Soviet Union and Afghanistan have been abiding by all provisions of these documents. Since 15th May the Soviet Union has returned home some 25 percent of its servicemen stationed in Afghanistan. On the other hand, weapons are still being sent to Afghanistan from Pakistani territory on a large scale. There are still what are known as Islamic regiments stationed in Pakistan. They are used to replenish the opposition armed groups acting in Afghanistan. All this is happening despite the fact that a stop of an activity of this kind is a key provision of the agreements that were signed in Geneva.

The Afghan president, Najibullah, has told the special session of the United Nations General Assembly that the Pakistani authorities' hindering the Afghan refugees returning home is also a flagrant violation of the Geneva accords. These accords, as you probably know, followed years of hard work and searches for mutually acceptable political solutions. They must lay a solid foundation for noninterference in the affairs of independent, nonaligned and neutral Afghanistan; for national reconciliation; and for an end to the bloodshed.

But the bloodshed is continuing. Direct responsibility for this is borne by all those who train armed units, send them to Afghanistan and supply them with weapons. The Soviet Union and Afghanistan have been honestly abiding by the commitments they have undertaken. At the same time, Pakistan has been violating its commitments for stopping interference in Afghan internal affairs. It's obvious a situation of this kind is no longer tolerable.

In the statement of 29th May, the Soviet Foreign Ministry pointed out that in this situation it would be natural for the Soviet Union and Afghanistan to draw proper conclusions with regard to the troops withdrawal schedule and carry out concrete moves to offset the illegal actions of the Pakistani authorities. Of course, this would be undesirable but forcible. [as heard] Let's hope Pakistan will strictly abide by all the commitments it undertook in Geneva.

More Protests to UN

LD1106221988 Moscow TASS in English 2044 GMT 11 Jun 88

[Text] Kabul June 11 TASS—Afghanistan's Foreign Ministry handed over three notes of protest against Pakistani violations of the Geneva accords to United Nations representatives in Kabul today, BAKHTAR News Agency said.

The notes say that the fire attack at border posts and residential quarters in the Spin Buldak District of Kandahar Province resulted in human casualties and destruction.

The Afghan side drew the attention of the U.N. officials to efforts by Pakistani authorities to prevent Afghan refugees from returning home.

The Afghan Government asked the U.N. observers to thoroughly investigate the facts cited in the notes and take effective measures to put an end to illegal actions by the Pakistani Administration.

Soviet Observance Noted

LD1206154388 Moscow TASS in English 1342 GMT 12 Jun 88

[Text] Kabul June 12 TASS—The BAKHTAR News Agency has issued a commentary which says, in particular, that one month that has passed since the Geneva accords entered into force has convincingly shown that the Republic of Afghanistan honestly and in good faith observes the obligations which it assumed in Geneva. Numerous facts indicate at the same time that the Pakistani side has adopted the opposite approach.

The start of the implementation of the provisions of the Geneva accords was regarded with joy by the Afghan people, and by the progressive public of the region and of the whole world. It became an example of a political solution to regional conflicts, organization, and enhanced its prestige. The fact of the consent of the Soviet Union and the United States to become the guarantors of the Geneva accords is of importance.

The Soviet Union and Afghanistan, the commentary goes on, strictly abide by the provisions of the accords, which found its relection in the start of the withdrawal of the Limited Contingent of Soviet Troops on May 15. As of today, a quarter of the Soviet contingent has already returned home. Missions of U.N. observers in Afghanistan opened with the specified time-frame and began to function.

Pakistan, for its part, not only continued to supply arms to extremist groups, thereby persisting in interference in the internal affairs of the sovereign republic but also increased the scope of supplies to such an extent that even the Western press does not deny the facts. For example, on May 24, two hundred lorries, riding via Teri Mangal and Paiwar border points of Pakistan, brought arms and ammunition to 'Ali Khel and Jaji Meydan on Afghan territory.

The Pakistani authorities continued to hinder Afghan refugees from returning home. Hostile propaganda with regard to Afghanistan has increased.

Besides, General Ziaul Haq trampled upon all norms of democracy by disbanding the Muhammad Khan Junejo Government which was inclined towards implementing the Geneva accords, and dissolved the National Assembly. According to Zain Noorani, Pakistani former minister of state for foreign affairs, he was removed from the post as a result of contradictions with Ziaul Haq over issues concerning the Geneva accords on Afghanistan. He declined further explanations in view of apprehensions that he might be put behind the bars, the commentary says.

If Pakistan does not take appropriate measures to end interference in Afghan internal affairs from Pakistani territory, the Republic of Afghanistan reserves the right to react to that as the situation would require.

Pakistan's political opposition parties, BAKHTAR points out, also urged Ziaul Haq to stop aiding the Afghan opposition and to create conditions for the repatriation of Afghan refugees.

Those who try to counteract the peace process should realise that they will not be able to go against the stream for long, the BAKHTAR commentary says in conclusion.

Foreign Ministry Statement

LD1306114388 Moscow TASS in English 1126 GMT 13 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 13 TASS—Follows the text of a statement by a spokesman for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR:

"On June 11 White House Spokesman Roman Popadiuk tried to refute the charges of violating Geneva accords brought against Pakistan. Roman Popadiuk cited as an argument the fact that the USSR, having rejected the U.S. proposal on mutual termination of aid to 'both sides', sort of sanctioned the continuation of arms supplies to the armed groups of Afghan opposition.

"The Soviet Union never agreed to its military aid to the legitimate government in the Republic of Afghanistan being linked in any form with arms supplies to the insurgent illegal groups which bank on the forcible overthrow of the government. In principle, there is hardly any need to reply to this kind of allegations each time. Such attempts were undertaken before Roman Popadiuk's statement and, apparently, will be undertaken in future as well.

"But it is not solely a matter of arms being supplied from the territory of Pakistan. Attempts are being made to evade a number of other obligations, which commit Pakistan to stopping interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan.

"The infrastructure of interference—military camps, training centres for the armed groups of the opposition, all manner of subversive-terroristic groups, created in the past years, has been completely preserved on Pakistani territory, especially in the North-Western Border Province. Military headquarters openly operate on Pakistani territory to direct the military actions of insurgents in Afghanistan. The sending to Afghanistan of these groups and detachments, together with foreign instructors, does not stop.

"Psychological warfare against the Republic of Afghanistan has been launched from the territory of Pakistan on an ever increasing scale. Moreover, patently provocative

actions are being made. The so-called 'Afghan News Agency', which must speak on behalf of the opposition groups members of the Alliance of Seven, is being formed with the aiding and abetting of the Pakistani authorities. Moreover, it is planned to locate the agency in no other place than Islamabad itself, to enlist the services of Pakistani journalists.

"All this is incompatible with the goals set during the signing of the Geneva accords, which clearly formulated them in the form of treaty provisions, to which Pakistan put its signature. For example, paragraph 12 of Article 2 of the agreement between Afghanistan and Pakistan on the principles of mutual relations reads: 'To prevent within its territory the presence, harbouring, in camps and bases or otherwise, organizing, training, financing, equipping and arming of individuals and political, ethnic and any other groups for the purpose of creating subversion, disorder or unrest in the territory of the other high contracting party and accordingly also to prevent the use of mass media and the transportation of arms, ammunition and equipment by such individuals and groups.' It seems that the American side, which is one of the guarantors of political settlement around Afghanistan, also bears its share of responsibility. And no arguments by Mr Popadiuk will help discard this responsibility."

Soviet Reinforcements Reported in Afghanistan

OW1306101688 Beijing XINHUA in English 0938 GMT 13 Jun 88

[Text] Islamabad, June 13 (XINHUA)—Four Soviet planes airshipped fresh Soviet troops into Jalalabad, capital of Nangarhar Province, about 105 kilometers east of Kabul, on June 9, from where the Soviet Union withdrew its 1,200 troops first when the Geneva accord came into force on May 15, the Afghan Media Resource Center (AMRC) quoted resistance sources as saying today.

The Soviets had vacated the city by pulling out another 1,000 troops from it in the following days after May 15. But later it was learnt that more than 500 Soviet soldiers and officers armed with rockets and artilleries still remained in Jalalabad, an important city from a strategic point of view for both the Kabul regime and the resistance forces, the AMRC said.

The arrival of the new Soviet troops is a step for the defense against attacks by Afghan Muslim guerrillas on Jalalabad, it added. The withdrawal of a Soviet brigade from the military cantonment of Samar Khel in the city has created an impression that the city would be an easy target for attacks by the resistance forces who are reported to have selected Jalalabad as their first attack target in their new moves to attack cities of the Kabul regime. The Kabul regime, however, has stepped up its measures to try to fend off any resistance attempts on the city of Jalalabad by reinforcing the garrison with an Army division and continued presence of Soviet special forces in the area.

Meanwhile, there is a huge Soviet air base there. The Soviets are reported to have been still manning the advanced MiGs and Sokhois.

Najibullah Ends Cuba Visit, Arrives in Moscow

Warns on Soviet Withdrawal

LD1106141688 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0645 GMT 11 Jun 88

[Text] Havana, 11 Jun (TASS)—Najibullah, president of the Republic of Afghanistan, has expressed hope here that wisdom, realism, and a feeling of responsibility will prevail in Pakistan in its approach to the fulfillment of the commitments undertaken by that country within the framework of the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan, instead of the violations of these agreements, which have been continuing. He has arrived in Cuba for an official visit after participating in the work of the third special session of the UN General Assembly on disarmament in New York.

Speaking on Friday at a news conference in Havana, he said that during the meeting with UN Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar in New York, the Afghan delegation gave a full explanation of violations of the Geneva agreements. "We issued a warning that if such violations continue, the USSR and Afghanistan will not consider themselves obliged to pave the way for the further withdrawal of Soviet troops, that we shall have to rethink the whole problem and respond to this situation as required." The UN secretary general and his personal representative, Cordovez, the president of the Republic of Afghanistan said, assured us that "they will make every effort" so that the Pakistani Government will act in strict accordance with the commitments it has undertaken with regard to the Geneva agreements. We are in an optimistic mood and we truly belive, Najibullah stated, that wisdom, realism, and a feeling of responsibility in Pakistan will replace the actions violating these agreements.

The Geneva agreements were signed on 15 April this year, he said. In other words, it has taken almost 6 years to achieve the aim. It has been very hard going, and yet, thanks to the constructive and flexible approach of the USSR and Afghanistan, to the good work of the secretary general of the United Nations and of his personal representative, and also to the good intentions of the other sides, we eventually signed the documents in Geneva. Those documents represent a "well-balanced and collective complex", the components of which add up to more than just the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. "There are other aspects of the agreement, also of fundamental importance, such as noninterference in Afghanistan's internal affairs, repatriation of refugees,

the guarantees by the United States and USSR concerning Afghanistan's internal affairs, and the system of instruments guaranteeing their fulfillment." He stressed in particular that all these provisions must be carried out as a whole, that there must be no interference of any kind in Afghan affairs, and that no obstacles must be put in the way of the repatriation of the refugees. The withdrawal of Soviet troops is merely an instrument associated with those principles.

The USSR and Afghanistan are honestly and consistently carrying out the commitments that they have undertaken. The withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghan soil began 15 May, precisely on schedule. "To date," Najibullah stressed, "34,000 Soviet internationalist servicemen have already returned home." Unfortunately we have to state that the Pakistani side is still "constantly declining in practice to carry out its commitments and is violating them."

Replying to a question from a journalist, Najibullah stated that explosions and other provocations are continuing in the country, since the interference is continuing. In this regard the question arises of the fulfillment of their commitments by the United States and Pakistan. With one hand they are signing the final documents of the Geneva negotiations and with the other they are violating them. He stressed that this is inadmissible and that responsibility for carrying out the agreements on Afghansitan must be borne by those who agreed to them.

Before my trip to New York, he went on to say, we had very detailed talks in Moscow. Afterwards there were talks in New York with Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze as well as with Perez de Cuellar, the UN secretary general, and Cordovez. Mr Shevardnadze gave the UN secretary general a note regarding Pakistan's violations of the Geneva agreements and requested that assistance be given to halt these violations and that special measures be taken to halt them. We also put forward these demands. The UN secretary general and his special representative assured us that everything possible will be done for this purpose. We await practical steps.

Then Najibullah dwelled on some aspects of the policy of national reconciliation in Afghanistan. I want to say, he said, that the aim of the policy is to secure peace in the country and eliminate senseless confrontation. It is necessary to solve problems by means of mutual understanding. Our principles are based on the unification of all political forces, including the opposition within the country and abroad, and the creation of a coalition government with the participation of broad sections of the population. It is on this basis that we intend to find a way to solve the internal aspects of the Afghan problem. Despite the existence of extremists, who view Afghanistan through their gun sights and who are not prepared for dialogue and reconciliation, this process is developing and has already actually shown its viability. It has already become an irreversible process. Afghanistan's new constitution says that political pluralism should be the basis for strengthening the country's sovereignty. That means a multiparty system, a mixed economy, and the principle of nonalignment. After a 15-year interval parliamentary elections were held in Afghanistan on 29 May, and the first session of parliament has been convened. I have already had a communication from Kabul that last Monday the new prime minister received a vote of confidence. The new Government contains three deputy premiers. This Government is coalitional in character. Besides members of the PDPA it includes representatives of other parties and political organizations, independent figures, and also some other members of former Afghan governments. The Government is due to play the part of a bridge on the way to the creation of a still more representative government that includes a broader spectrum of forces.

Met by Shevardnadze 12 Jun

LD1206135588 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1329 GMT 12 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow, 12 Jun (TASS)—Najibullah, president of the Republic of Afghanistan and general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee, has arrived in Moscow on his way back to his homeland today from Havana. He was in Cuba on an official visit after taking part in the work of the special session on disarmament of the UN General Assembly in New York.

At the airport he was met by Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Foreign Minister Petr Demichev, candidate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and Anatoliy Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Among those meeting him were Muhammadullah Safi', ambassador of the Republic of Afghanistan to the USSR, and Julio Camacho, ambassador of the Republic of Cuba to the USSR.

Departs Moscow 13 Jun

LD1306113188 Moscow TASS in English 1120 GMT 13 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 13 TASS—Afghan President and General Secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan Najibullah left Moscow today.

He was on a brief stop-over here on his way home from Cuba. The Afghan official visited Cuba following his participation in the third session of the U.N. General Assembly on disarmament in New York.

At the airport, the president was seen off by Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and foreign minister of the USSR,

Petr Demichev, alternate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and first vice president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Anatoliy Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and other officials.

The send-off party included the ambassador of Afghanistan to the Soviet Union, Muhamadullah Safi'.

Pakistani Ambassador Summoned Over POW's

LD1306110588 Moscow TASS in English 1040 GMT 13 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 13 TASS—Pakistan's ambassador to the Soviet Union, Shahid Mohammad Amin, was summoned to the Foreign Ministry of the USSR here today to see First Deputy Foreign Minister Yuliy Vorontsov who once again raised the issue of Soviet POW's still being kept at armed Afghan opposition camps in Pakistani territory.

The Soviet side has for a number of years been insisting that Pakistani authorities take measures towards the liberation of these Soviet citizens and their return home.

As a result of these efforts it has proved possible in the past to secure the release of several Soviet servicemen and their return to the USSR. The Pakistani side's actions in this respect have been given their due in this country.

After the signature of the Geneva agreements on an Afghanistan settlement in April 1988 the Soviet side has repeatedly approached the Pakistani leadership, including President Ziaul Haq in person more than once, on this issue of concern to all the Soviet people.

The ambassador was told that the Soviet Union expects the president to make good his promises and the Pakistani side to adopt most urgent and concrete measures in this respect.

The Soviet Foreign Ministry has sent requests to the leaders of a number of countries maintaining friendly relations with Pakistan as well as to the United Nations and other international organizations to facilitate an immediate return of these Soviet servicemen to their motherland.

India, Syrian Leaders Cited on Afghanistan

LD1006104588 Moscow TASS in English 1805 GMT 9 Jun 88

[Text] New Delhi June 9 TASS—Leaders of India and Afghanistan expressed today a profound concern over Pakistan's continuing violations of the Geneva accords on Afghanistan. A PTI News Agency correspondent reports that the matter was discussed by the Prime Minister of India Rajiv Gandhi and the President of Afghanistan Najibullah during their meeting in New York. The Indian prime minister said he fully shared the concern expressed by the Afghan president over Islamabad's actions, and warned Pakistan against the pursuit of this course. He stressed that only a bona fide implementation of the Geneva accords would ensure peace in Afghanistan and the whole of that region. It is our view, Rajiv Gandhi said, that the Geneva accords offer not only the best but also the only way out of the present situation. If the accords are not implemented, the situation will get into an impasse and may further deteriorate.

The Indian premier said that the greatest threat is posed by attempts to foist on Afghanistan by force a fanatical religious-fundamentalist government which will not only complicate the situation in the entire region but will also have harmful consequences for other parts of the world.

India, Rajiv Gandhi went on to say, wishes to see Afghanistan deciding its future by itself, without any outside interference or intervention. We wish to see Afghanistan a non-aligned but by no means a religious-fundamentalist country.

The prime minister of India who had previously paid an official visit to Syria, said that the Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad also made clear his government's opposion to any broad representation of religious fundamentalists in a would-be administration of Afghanistan.

Afghan 'Extremists' Liquidated by Armed Forces

LD1206102388 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0510 GMT 12 Jun 88

[Text] Kabul, 12 Jun (TASS)—An operation to liquidate extremist opposition groups has been conducted by the Afghan Armed Forces in Kapisa Province. Dozens of extremists were killed during the military operations. Mortars, rocket launchers, heavy machineguns, ammunition, and communications equipment were captured.

In Qandahar Province, a gang of professional criminals has been liquidated. They had been robbing and killing peaceful citizens. Reports are coming in from several regions in Afghanistan on internecine clashes between detachments belonging to various armed opposition factions. Considerable damage has been done to inhabited settlements in the zone of these battles.

Afghan 'Terrorist Groups' Routed in 2 Provinces

LD1106222788 Moscow TASS in English 1457 GMT 11 Jun 88

[Text] Kabul June 11 TASS—At jirgahs which took place in Paktia Province, the chiefs and elders of Pashtun tribes stated their full support for the Geneva accords and the humane goals of the national reconciliation policy. They also expressed readiness to render all-round assistance to the families of compatriots returning from abroad, the BAKHTAR News Agency reported.

Over the time that has passed since the reconciliation policy was proclaimed, 50,000 patriots have returned to Herat Province and more than seven thousand members of the armed opposition discontinued anti-government activity.

Extremist provocations compel the Afghan Army to take retaliatory measures. Over the past twenty-four hours, two terrorist groups were routed in Ghazni and Farah provinces, and an arms and ammunition depot was eliminated in Ghazni.

Algiers Pan-Arab Summit Results Summarized

'Serious Blow' to U.S.

LD1006133988 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 10 Jun 88

[Text] And now a comment on the outcome of the Arab emergency summit in Algiers, contributed by Aleksandr Pogodin:

Frankly speaking, on the opening day of the summit on Tuesday, I was disinclined to predict full unity of opinion on the main item on its agenda—the Palestinian uprising on the Israeli occupied lands. I recalled all the differences and disputes in the Arab world which usually surfaced at such summits. Now I have to state with satisfaction that I was wrong in my guarded view, writes Aleksandr Pogodin. The dialogue in which leaders of Arab states and of the PLO took part brought about unanimous adoption of the final documents. Here are the principal points of the accords reached in Algiers:

Full support is given to the struggle of the Palestinian people against the Israeli occupation. There is a demand for holding at an early date an international conference under United Nations auspices and a settlement in the Middle East. As the Arab summit noted, at this conference all the interested sides must be represented, including the PLO and the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council.

The outcome of the Algiers summit is a strong indication that the strength of the Arab nations lies in the unity of their ranks, in the cohesion and coordination of their actions. Thus, notably, a serious blow has been made to the designs of Israel and the United States which are trying to make use of the disunity in the Arab world for their own ends. There has been a tell-tale comment on the results of the summit by REUTER, which said that this meeting torpedoed the Shultz plan. Indeed, the decisive demands made in Algiers run contrary to the half-measures the United States tries to impose on the Arabs. That applies also to the proposal for holding a conference that should become only an umbrella for separate deals with Israel and plans of introducing a strictly limited autonomy for the Palestinians. As I see it, Aleksandr Pogodin continues, it is quite obvious that now both Israel and the United States will have to take into account seriously the rather unpleasant reality that there is Arab unity in the struggle to eliminate the consequences of Israeli aggression.

At a meeting in New York between the Israeli premier, Yitzhaq Shamir, held at his request on Thursday, and the Soviet foreign minister, Eduard Shevardnadze, the Israeli leader was told it was necessary for his country to abandon its obstructionist policy. Eduard Shevardnadze emphasized that it is impossible to have a real settlement between Arabs and Israel (?by pressing) for the maintenance of Israeli control over Arab lands, by denying the Palestinian people the right to self-determination, and by ignoring their lawful representatives. Only an approach based on strict observance of the balance of interests of all the sides, both Arabs, including the Palestinians, and Israel, will make it possible to untie the old Middle East knot and to ensure free development and safe existence of all the states and peoples in the region.

Summit Resolution Noted

LD1006150788 Moscow TASS in English 1235 GMT 10 Jun 88

[Text] Algiers June 10 TASS—TASS correspondent Korzelev reports:

The extraordinary Arab summit meeting has supported the idea of holding an international peace conference on the Middle East under the U.N. aegis.

A resolution adopted by the summit pointed out the need for the participation in the conference of five members of the U.N. Security Council and other parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization on an equitable basis with all other participants.

The Arab leaders demanded that Israel withdraw from all the occupied Arab territories and that the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and national independence be ensured.

The resolution demanded as well that all the Israeli settlements that had appeared on Arab lands since 1967 be dismantled, that the West Bank of the Jordan river and the Gaza sector be put under U.N. protection for a transitional period not exceeding several months and that the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and the creation of an independent state on their national territory under the leadership of PLO, the only lawful representative of the Palestinian people, be respected.

'Arafat Condemns Shultz Plan

LD1206061488 Moscow TASS in English 0604 GMT 12 Jun 88

[Text] Tripoli June 12 TASS—Yasir 'Arafat, head of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organisation, hailed the results of the Arab summit which recently ended in the capital of Algeria. Addressing the

session of the General People's Congress of Libya in the town of Al-Bayda on Saturday, he pointed out that the Arab summit put paid to the American variants of settling the Middle Eastern conflict, including the so-called Shultz plan. The U.S. state secretary, 'Arafat said, went on a tour of the region shortly before the Algerian conference, trying to influence its outcome and decisions. The summit meeting reaffirmed the strength of the Arab peoples. The chairman of the PLO Executive Committee denounced Washington's aid to Israel.

Speaking about human rights, Yasir 'Arafat exposed allegations of the West that freedoms thrived in Western countries and noted that human rights were violated in Western society every day and every hour. He cited as an example persecution against blacks and Indians in the United States.

Glukhov Views Shultz Mideast Trip, Prospects

PM1006153188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jun 88 Second Edition p 5

[Yuriy Glukhov "Viewpoint": "Unraveling the Knot"]

[Text] U.S. Secretary of State Shultz has paid another visit to the Near East. This is the U.S. foreign policy department head's fourth visit in the past few months to the zone of the Arab-Israeli conflict—one of the most protracted and explosive conflicts.

Suffice it to recall that it is now 21 years since the 6-Day War and Tel Aviv's capture and occupation of the Arab lands of the Gaza Strip, the West Bank of the Jordan, East Jerusalem, and Syria's Golan Heights. It is now 6 years since the beginning of Israel's aggression against Lebanon, which continues to this day.

In this long-running situation, which is fraught with complications, the question of eliminating the consequences of aggression, the liberation of the occupied Arab territories, the realization of the Palestinian people's legitimate rights, the safeguarding of the security of all the states and peoples of the region, including Israel and the Palestinians, and the establishment of a just, lasting peace has been, and remains, acute.

The solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict has become an urgent requirement. It should be pointed out that real factors related to a political settlement have appeared. As stated when summing up the results of the recent Moscow summit, an understanding exists that a solution must be achieved within the framework of an international conference. There is an acknowledged need to consider the interests of all countries and sides in the region which have been affected by the conflict. And, finally, there is an acknowledgment that a settlement must be based on the principled provisions of the relevant UN resolutions.

Undoubtedly the international conference must be an active and effective forum which would be interlinked with bilateral, trilateral, and other forms of work, and not a cover for separate talks. Representatives of the Palestinian Arab people in the form of the PLO, its legitimate representative, must participate in it.

Of course, one cannot be indifferent to the direction of the U.S. efforts at this decisive stage. Are the zones of collaboration and cooperation in the search for a just and stable Near East settlement widening or narrowing? That is the only criterion applicable to an evaluation of the U.S. Near East initiatives.

In what vein was the Secretary of State's latest trip carried out?

In the opinion of some political observers, notes of realism sounded in some of Shultz's comments. "The trampling of the Palestinians' rights," he stated, for example, "is a dead end. It is an illusion to believe that things can go on that way." However, the secretary of state did not distance himself either from Israel's aggressive policy or from support of it. As a result Western agencies have viewed his trip as a last attempt to persuade the Arab countries to accept the U.S. plan—separate, that is—for a settlement before the extraordinary conference of the heads of Arab states which is beginning in Algiers. That is why the Arabs were skeptical of Shultz' peacemaking efforts.

However, the quite inevitable failure of Washington's policy should not discredit the actual idea of seeking a political settlement. On the contrary, it confirmed with renewed force and for all to see that the time has come for collective efforts to unravel the tight Near East knot.

Envoy to Jordan on Soviet, U.S. Mideast Stances

JN0806121388 Amman AL-DUSTUR in Arabic 8 Jun 88 pp 1, 19

[By Wafa' 'Amr]

[Text] Soviet Ambassador to Jordan Aleksandr Zinchuk has affirmed that Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz will hold a special meeting soon to discuss the Middle East issue and their countries differences over ways to solve this issue. The meeting will take place in accordance with a decision taken during the recent summit of the two superpowers in Moscow.

In an interview with AL-DUSTUR, Zinchuk said the meeting of the Soviet and U.S. leaders in Moscow has not eliminated their basic differences. He added that the Soviet side was prepared to take an advanced position and hold comprehensive talks on all points of differences and agreement with the United States, but the United States was not prepared to take such a position.

Zinchuk also explained that the points of difference center on the form of an international conference on the Middle East. He said: The two sides agreed on the idea of and the need for convening an international conference, but the differences in their views still center on how to convene it. The United States wants an open conference while we are seeking an effective and constructive international conference accepted by all parties.

He also pointed out that the differences between U.S. President Ronald Reagan and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev over the Middle East were also coupled with differences between the two foreign ministers and the expert team on the Middle East. [sentence as published]

The Soviet ambassador added that the point of differences also cover Palestinian representation at an international conference and the fact that the United States refuses to contact the PLO directly, although it approves of the invitation to the PLO to attend the conference. He said his country's position on Palestinian representation is well known to every one, and that the Soviet Union stresses the need for the PLO to attend the conference and represent itself on an equal footing with the other parties involved in the Arab-israeli conflict.

He also said the United States still sticks to Shultz' peace initiative on the Middle East, especially with regard to Palestinian representation, while the Soviet Union insists on the PLO's representation at an international conference through an independent or joint delegation. The PLO and the other Arab countries are entitled to determine the form of the Palestinian representation. He added: During the Moscow summit, we noticed a development in the U.S. position on several issues, foremost of which is U.S. approval of a Soviet role in solving the Middle East problem. We also noticed such a development on other issues.

He also referred to the cordial atmosphere which prevailed at the Moscow summit, expressing hope that Soviet and U.S. views will be brought close together. But, he said, the United States did not completely abandon its previous positions because it was not prepared to disucuss all differences between the two countries on the Palestine question when the Soviet Union proposed that all differences be settled and the solutions documented.

Asked about Soviet aspirations regarding the extraordinary Arab summit in Algiers, he said the summit will discuss the uprising and ways to support it politically and materially, and that the Arab countries should adopt unified resolutions on this issue and support the PLO and the uprising. He also stressed his country's call for a unified Arab position: "It is better for the Arab countries to talk in one voice regarding all their causes in order to reach the international conference with a unified position to confront Israel."

The Soviet ambassador also discussed his country's concept of the Palestinian right to self-determiantion. He said: My country believes in the Palestinian right to establish an independent Palestinian state or any other form they want such as a confederation with a neighboring Arab country. "The Soviet Union announced this position in 1984, and we discussed this issue during the Moscow summit."

Regarding the Gulf war, Zinchuk said the United Sates wants the Soviet Union to adopt an arms embargo against Iran. He added: But we say that Security Council Resolution No. 598 still has a chance, and we must wait. He also said: "The Iraqi victories may soon end the war."

Consular Pact With Algeria Initialed

LD1106012288 Moscow TASS in English 1619 GMT 10 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 10 TASS—Soviet-Algerian consultations on consular affairs were held at the USSR Foreign Ministry on June 6-10, 1988. A consular convention between the Soviet Union and Algeria was initialled during the consultations. An (?agreement) was reached to simplify the issuing of visas. Other matters of bilateral consular relations were discussed. Head of the Algerian delegation, chief of the Consular Directorate of Algeria's Foreign Ministry Ibrahim Taiebi was received by USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Viktor Komplektov. Algeria's Ambassador to Moscow Mohamed Yala took part in the conversation.

Dobrynin Receives Bangladesh CP Delegation

LD1106220288 Moscow TASS in English 1333 GMT 11 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 11 TASS—On June 10 Anatoliy Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, had a meeting with a delegation of the Communist Party of Bangladesh (CPB) led by Saifuddin Ahmed Manik, general secretary of the CPB Central Committee.

The Bangladesh comrades spoke of their party's activities, and its struggle for the vital interests of the working people of Bangladesh, for democratisation of sociopolitical life in the country, and for social progress. They gave a high appraisal of the CPSU's foreign policy line aimed at achieving universal security, at reducing and eliminating nuclear weapons, and at creating a climate of genuine trust and mutual understanding between peoples.

The delegation members showed a great interest in the current processes of restructuring in the Soviet Union, and asked many questions in this connection. They emphasised that restructuring was of immense international significance.

The secretary of the CPSU Central Committee described the course of preparation for the 19th all-union party conference which will become an event of fundamental importance for the cause of renewal of society. It was emphasised that it is precisely through restructuring that the humanistic nature and creative might of socialism are being revealed.

The CPB delegation was acquainted with the main results of the Moscow meeting between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States. The chief result is that the dialogue covering the key problems of world politics was contained and that yet another step on the way towards a better world set-up was made. The interlocutors highly appreciated the results of the summit, and pointed out its wholesome influence on the situation in the world.

Some matters of inter-party relations were also discussed and some aspects of the international communist movement were touched upon during the conversation. The sides declared in favour of further development and strengthening of contacts between the CPSU and CPB, for friendship and cooperation between the Soviet and Bangladesh peoples.

Sub-Saharan Africa

African Groups Pin Hopes on Moscow Summit

LD1006152988 Moscow in English to Africa 1700 GMT 30 May 88

[Excerpts] And now Andrey Dolgov analyzes the African aspect of the Moscow summit between the Soviet Communist Party leader Mikhail Gorbachev and the United States President Ronald Reagan:

Political groups in Africa have pinned hopes on the Moscow summit. They hope the Soviet-American dialogue will improve the international situation and relax tension. If the world is rid of tension it will be easier for Africa to solve its problems—writing an end to apartheid and colonialism in the south; coping with the economic crisis around the continent; or getting action on the idea of a nuclear-free zone in Africa. What's more, the African and other developing countries could more energetically influence the world events and uphold their lawful interests and hopes.

The questions of war and peace, the aversion of a nuclear catastrophe and the curbing of the arms race have been given prominence in the policy of both separate African countries and the Organization of African Unity. [passage omitted] The elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles holds out (?no) promise of much funds released, whereas fairly impressive funds could be used for people if strategic offensive arms were cut by half. Of course, African politicians will focus attention on the results of a Soviet-American discussion of regional conflicts. The Geneva accords on Afghanistan, with Moscow and Washington acting as guarantors, can largely serve as an example of a peaceful political settlement of conflicts in the other parts of the world.

Anyone can see the changes for the better in Soviet-American relations have made the international situation more favourable for political solutions of this kind. There have been signs of a movement toward peace in Nicaragua. Ethiopia is normalizing relations with Somalia and improving them with Sudan. And the Chad-Libyan conflict, too, is being settled. Southern Africa has remained the world's most troubled spot. The apartheid regime with its aggression against Angola and other Frontline States keeps jeopardizing peace, security, and international stability. But there, too, is some movement toward a political settlement.

Proof are the talks between Angola, Cuba, and South Africa, with the United States acting as go-between. The whole of Africa hopes that at the Moscow talks the two great nations will be able to help the conflicting sides reach mutually acceptable decisions. It is definite a settlement in the region could be prompted by a United States renunciation of support for the antigovernment UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] group in Angola. The view is held in both Moscow and the African capitals. Nonetheless, Washington has continued to refuse to reconsider both its interference in Angolan affairs and virtual support for South African aggression. As for the Soviet Union, it is in favor of settling the conflict politically, with due regard for the interests of all the parties concerned. And, of course, with the strict observance of the right of nations to a social, economic, and political choice.

The Soviet Union will support the decisions that will suit Angola, Cuba, and Namibian freedom, (?upholding) SWAPO [South-West African Peoples' Organization]. The Soviet approach meets the all-African position, as we can see this from the resolutions adopted by the OAU Ministerial Council. [passage omitted] These are the hopes. In a few days we'll see how real they are.

TASS, Nigeria Sign News Service Agreement

LD1006225988 Moscow TASS in English 1645 GMT 10 Jun 88

[Text] Lagos June 10 TASS—A protocol on the establishment of direct telex channel via a satellite between the news agency of Nigeria NAN and TASS was signed in Lagos today. The document envisages the creation of an around-the-clock two-way channel for the exchange of news service between the agencies.

The introduction of a channel via a satellite will make it possible to increase the exchange of news service between TASS and NAN which will contribute to the effort to create a new international information order, Deputy General Manager of NAN, Williams Bozimo said at a ceremony here. Cooperation with TASS gives the Nigerian agency additional opportunity to put its

news service on the world information market. This promotes the spread of truthful information about the events in Nigeria and Africa and impedes the attempts of news agencies controlled by the West to present the events in the African Continent in a distorted light.

Diplomatic Relations With Benin Reviewed

LD1106031888 Moscow in English to Africa 1700 GMT 4 Jun 88

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Twenty-six years ago, on 4 June, diplomatic relations were established between the People's Republic of Benin and the Soviet Union. Here is our commentary:

The establishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries 26 years ago set the beginning to the development of versatile contacts and cooperation, based on the principles that the Soviet Union adheres to in its relations with other independent African countries. These principles include respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, equality, and the honoring of mutual interests.

The two countries, the Soviet Union and the then Dahomey, covered quickly the path that led from the establishment of diplomatic relations to the development of specific directions of bilateral cooperation. It took them only 1 year to prepare and to sign agreements on cooperation in the field of science, culture, and trade. The subsequent years made it possible to accumulate the necessary experience and to open new opportunities for fruitful contacts between the two countries. The coming to power in October 1972 of the patriotic forces led by the incumbent President Mathieu Kerekou gave a fresh impetus to the development of contacts between the two countries. The new leadership proclaimed the country's socialist orientation. According to President Kerekou, Benin's choice in favor of the socialist way of development accords with the legitimate demands of the working people, who have stepped together with other revolutionary peoples of the world into the road of development and social progress shown by the 1917 Russian socialist revolution.

The progressive way of development chosen by Benin helped step up its cooperation with the Soviet Union and to bring the positions of the two countries closer together on the international scene. Both Benin and the Soviet Union resolutely oppose any manifestations of neocolonialism, racism, and apartheid, and express their effective solidarity with the fighters for national and social liberation. The governing parties of the two countries, the People's Revolution of Benin Party and the Soviet Communist Party, have established friendly contacts and are making good headway. Contacts of the two countries in the field of education and culture have brought about positive results. Hundreds of young people of Benin have been trained at Soviet colleges in professions needed for the normal development of Benin. Residents of Cotonou and other cities have had an opportunity on many occasions to get acquainted with the art of Soviet performers, who made concert tours in the republic. Soviet films shown in Benin every year during film weeks are well-known to cinema audiences in that country. The Soviet Union helps Benin train research workers, carry out geological prospecting, and organize new forms of agricultural production. Opportunities are considered at present for developing cooperation in other fields, outlined during the visit to this country of Benin's president and the chairman of the Central Committee of the People's Revolution of Benin Party, Mathieu Kerekou. Soviet people are eager to continue cementing friendship with the people of Benin.

Situation in Horn of Africa Discussed

LD1106033388 Moscow in English to Africa 1700 GMT 2 Jun 88

[From the "Africa as We See It" feature]

[Text] We now bring you a commentary by (?Eduard Babasadiy), a NOVOSTI press agency correspondent who has spent many years in Addis Ababa:

It's generally known that the situation in the Horn of Africa is extremely complex. The border issue, the heritage of the region's colonial past, has many times become the reason for armed conflicts between the peoples of this vast region. Relations between Somalia and Ethiopia, the key to the situation in the Horn of Africa, have until recently remained tense, so tense in fact that there were armed clashes on the border. Then in January 1986 the leader of Ethiopia, Mengistu Haile Mariam, met the president of Somalia, Siad Barre, in Djibouti and that was their first move toward bilateral contacts. This April the sides agreed to restore diplomatic relations and to forego interference in each other's affairs. The fact that the two sides pulled their troops back from their borders is an indication of how serious they are.

The Ethiopia-Somalia understandings were evaluated by many diplomats and observers as an instance of new political thinking, of realism, and a sense of responsibility on the part of the two countries. It is to be hoped, said the Deputy Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union Petrovkskiy, that this move will pave the way to a settlement in the Horn of Africa, and in general to political solutions of other conflicts and crises on the African Continent.

The process of normalization in the Horn of Africa, however, is now endangered by events in northern Ethiopia, where separatists this spring renewed their armed struggle. Their aim is to recarve the political map of East Africa and to dismember Ethiopia, chopping it up into several ministates. The separatist attacks have considerably aggravated the situation in that part of the world, especially their timing, for they came when a very realistic chance had appeared to smooth out yet another knot of contradictions in the Horn of Africa and to settle

differences between Sudan and Ethiopia, where with wisdom and goodwill the leaders had voiced a mutual striving to establish a lasting peace in the region and to reinforce cooperation in different areas for the benefit of their peoples.

Events in the all too often contradiction-ridden Horn of Africa confirm that in each specific case it is necessary to build up experience in rationally solving crisis situations that would not infringe on the interests of any of the parties concerned.

Radio Program Comments on Somali Unrest

EA1006110988 Moscow International Service in Amharic 1530 GMT 8 Jun 88

[Text] In tonight's program we present: Somalia Desires Peace. Even after Somalia signed an agreement to improve its relations with Ethiopia on 3 April it is hard to say that peace will prevail in northern Somalia.

Mohamed Siad Barre, the country's president and leader of the ruling Somali Revolutionary Socialist Party, has earned great respect within the country. In spite of signing an agreement in 1980 allowing the United States to use the facilities of the Port of Berbera and its incomparably long runway, the president is considered to have made a major individual contribution to Somalia's independent foreign policy. Siad Barre is praised because encouraging results have been consolidated in agriculture and education and a general increase has been achieved in production by virtue of the party and the revolutionary growth program.

However, there has been no respite in antigovernment activities in the northern part of the country. It is forbidden to say openly that Somali society is split by various clan divisions.

Diplomats, however, believe that the Somali president is strengthening his hold by appointing representatives of his own Marehan tribe to government and Army leadership posts. Representatives of the Isaaq clan who reside in northern Somalia are aggrieved by this. They have established the Somali National Movement [SNM] which opposes Siad Barre. There has been no peace around Somalia's second largest town, Hargeisa, since the beginning of the eighties.

All Somali people more or less have a common language and culture. However, the division of society along clan lines has complicated life in the country and preserved the unstable situation in the north.

In fact, it would be possible to relax the tension in northern Somalia, but it is clear that this cannot be done by force of arms. Curing this longstanding ailment would surely strengthen the unity of the people, because the current economic and social tasks facing all Somalis today could be surmounted when unity prevails. The country desires peace.

In conclusion, another event linked with Somalia must be mentioned. In his interview for AFP, Djibouti President Hassan Gouled Aptidon stated that his country does not intend to become a stepping stone or a launching pad for the SNM. The Djibouti president confirmed that his country in no way wishes to destabilize the situation in Somalia, which is its neighbor.

Petrovskiy, Tanzania's Nyerere Meet in New York

LD0906092888 Moscow TASS in English 0648 GMT 9 Jun 88

[Text] New York June 9 TASS—Vladimir Petrovskiy, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, has met here with Julius Nyerere, chairman of the Revolutionary Party of Tanzania, and has informed him at the request of the Soviet leadership of the results of the Soviet-American summit in Moscow.

Julius Nyerere expressed high appreciation of the Moscow summit and gratitude to Mikhail Gorbachev for his efforts aimed at creating a safe nuclear-free world, as well as for his attention to the ideas and proposals coming from the Group of Six and the Nonaligned Movement.

Nyerere expressed hope that the results achieved at the Soviet-American summit would set the beginning of a procesess of continuous advance in the nuclear reduction, the discontinuation of their tests and their eventual elimination.

U.S. Role in Angolan Fighting Claimed

LD0906023888 Moscow in Portuguese to Africa 1830 GMT 8 Jun 88

[Excerpts] Recently the U.S. newspaper THE NEW YORK TIMES published an article by its observer James Reston on wars today. This is what our commentator, Vladimir Grigoryev, writes:

Reston's article is full of casualty figures for the wars that have been waged in several parts of the world for many years. [passage omitted] No doubt these figures are a reason for reflection. But I would like to draw attention to the following: While recording the real number of victims, James Reston does not say a single word about the causes of the wars. However, each war has its roots. Thus, for example, at the basis of the escalation of tension in southern Africa is the aggressive and expansionist policy of the racist Pretoria regime, which is fully supported by the United States. [passage omitted]

The United States, which protects the bandits and the racists, is constantly adding fuel to this war. Until recently, U.S. support for UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] was indirect or through secret channels, but after the revocation of the Clark Amendment, military and other assistance to the terrorists was direct.

For a long time southern Angola has been the testing ground for South African and U.S.-manufactured modern military equipment. This is why, as the Angolan leaders and heads of many African states have repeatedly said, the United States can be justly described as a direct participant in the undeclared war against Angola. The military operations, which have not ended in the southern part of this country, absolutely differ from James Reston's statements that with the exception of the Gulf War, all wars between countries have ended. In Angola the war goes on.

Vladimir Grigoryev continues: Neither am I in agreement with another statement by Reston, that there were no or virtually no discussions at the recent meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Reagan attempting to end wars currently being waged. I do not believe that the respected observer is not familiar with the Moscow summit joint statement. It says in an absolutely determined way that the leaders of the two countries reaffirmed their intention to help the parties involved in the conflicts to find peaceful solutions. [passage omitted]

In pursuit of a political settlement in southern Africa, the U.S. representatives are participating as intermediaries in the talks between Angola, Cuba, and South Africa. Meanwhile, how do they combine the roles of intermediaries and arms suppliers to the bandits? This question has been raised repeatedly.

The USSR is ready to join the talks at any moment. This was also discussed in Moscow. The main thing is that all parties in the conflict should really desire peace and a peaceful solution.

As for Angola, it has never prepared and is not preparing for war. This is what President Jose Eduardo dos Santos declared once again in an interview with foreign reporters in Luanda. It is only defending itself from South African aggression and the apartheid regime's other allies. But this is what James Reston preferred not to see. He choose instead to see the causes as being similar to those in other regions.

Grigoryev Views Mozambique Land Reform

LD1106032788 Moscow in English to Africa 1700 GMT 2 Jun 88

[Text] In "Africa as We See It," our commentator Vladimir Grigoriyev speaks of the land reform in Mozambique:

If you were to drop into the market in Maputo, your impression would be that this is a land of plenty; the counters are overflowing with vegetables and fruits; the market is no less plentiful than, say, in Brazzaville or in Accra. Then why a land reform, you may ask? The thing is that the Maputo market is the only one of its kind in Mozambique. There are many provinces where the soil is no worse, perhaps even better, than in the environs of Maputo, but which have to be supplied with foodstuffs. At present, Mozambique is unable to produce the necessary amount of food. There are several reasons for that. The first, and no doubt main reason is the rampaging Renamo [Mozambique National Resistance] gangs. To escape the terrorists, the peasants are fleeing their villages, seeking protection near big cities. Thousands of hectares of fertile land have gone to weed.

Another reason is that until quite recently the peasants have actually not owned the land. Following independence, the people's government nationalized the land that had belonged to the colonialists. Under the Mozambique Constitution, all the land in the country is the property of the state. If the land was awarded to anyone it was the cooperatives, but in most cases no one oversaw how it was used. Private farms sprouted on state-owned land and it is they that supply the markets with food.

The leaders of Mozambique have frankly admitted the shortcomings of their agricultural policy. President Joaquim Chissano has gone on record as saying that the collectivization of the first years of independence was much too hurried and there were violations. In quite a few instances the formation of farm cooperatives disrupted traditional relations in the countryside. Those mistakes in collectivization resulted in most of the farms falling into decline. The farmers never did become the masters of the land that had been promised them. Live and learn, and the leadership of the Frelimo [Mozambique Liberation Front] Party is now rectifying the situation with due account for the experience of the past.

Last June, the government decided to mount a land reform. A private or family-run farm is to be the basic production unit in the countryside. (?It's) the family's, and that means about 2 million peasants (?that) will receive plots of land as big as 10 hectare. The farmers will then decide whether they will grow crops or use their land to pasture cattle. The farmers may either sell what they produce to the government or take their crops to market, after paying a tax for the use of the land.

The main objective of the reform is to have the land resources put to most efficient use and to gain self-sufficiency in food production. It is being effected for the benefit of those who till the land.

Briefs

USSR-PDRE Hydrogeology Pact

Addis Ababa, 9 Jun (TASS)—A protocol on cooperation between the USSR and Ethiopia in carrying out hydrogeological work in arid regions in the southeast of that country was signed today in Addis Ababa. In accordance with this document, 50 Soviet hydrogeological specialists will arrive in Ethiopia this year, and vital equipment also will be sent. [Excerpt] [*LD1106010588 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1900 GMT 9 Jun 88*]

East Europe

Whitehead Briefs GDR's Honecker on Summit

LD1206092588 Moscow TASS in English 0759 GMT 12 Jun 88

[Text] Berlin June 12 TASS—Erich Honecker, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED), president of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic (GDR), on Saturday received John Whitehead, U.S. undersecretary of state, who, on an instruction from the U.S. President, informed him of the course and results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

Mr Whitehead described the Moscow summit as a success. He pointed out that the exchange of the instruments of the ratification of the INF Treaty was of particular importance. Substantial progress had been achieved with regard to a treaty on a 50 per cent cut in the strategic offensive arms of the United States and the Soviet Union (S.T.A.R.T.). It had been agreed purposefully to continue to work on a S.T.A.R.T. treaty and to sign it as far as possible within President Reagan's term of office.

At the same time Mr Whitehead pointed out that there still remained differences between the Soviet Union and the United States over fundamental questions. Nevertheless Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev had expressed an intention to proceed along the chosen road.

Erich Honecker emphasized that the GDR approved of and supported the results of the Moscow summit which would serve to strengthen peace and international security. He highly appreciated the entering into force of the INF Treaty which set the beginning of an era of nuclear disarmament.

The leader of the GDR described as inspiring the progress in the elaboration of a S.T.A.R.T. treaty. He spoke out in favour of including tactical nuclear weapons in the disarmamet process, and voiced concern over the fact that adherence to the doctrines of deterrence and attempts at compensating reductions in nuclear weapons by arming in other fields would greatly hamper a continuation of the disarmament process.

"The GDR will do all it can to go along the road of arms reduction, the lessening of confrontation, and their replacement by disarmament and cooperation. An international meeting being convened in Berlin this month on the initiative of the GDR for the establishment of nuclear-free zones is to make a substantial contribution to reducing nuclear arms and to building a world free from nuclear weapons".

Belousov, Poland's Messner Meet at Poznan Fair

LD1306054988 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2200 GMT 12 Jun 88

[Excerpts] The 60th international fair opened in the Polish town of Poznan today. [passage omitted] Messner, member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the PPR Council of Ministers, visited the Soviet stand and praised it highly. The Polish leader received Belousov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, who heads the Soviet delegation. Questions of bilateral trade and economic ties, particularly of further expanding coproduction and production specialization, as well as direct ties among enterprises and the setting up of Polish-Soviet joint societies, were touched on during the conversation. It was noted that the new forms of cooperation among the enterprises of both countries have already yielded the first positive results.

Bulgarian Delegation Stops Off in Tbilisi

AU0906185588 Sofia BTA in English 1745 GMT 9 Jun 88

[Text] Tbilisi, June 9 (BTA spec. corr.)—On their way home the head of the Bulgarian Government and the officials accompanying him made a brief stay in the capital of Soviet Georgia. There they met Mr Dzhumber Patiashvili, first secretary of the Communist Party of Georgia, and Mr Otar Cherkeziya, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic. The talks were also attended by Mr Khristo Khristov, minister at the Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations, and Mr Ivan Ganev, deputy minister of foreign affairs. In a friendly atmosphere the two sides discussed the broadening of economic contacts between Bulgaria and Georgia.

West Europe

Vatican Secretary of State Arrives in Moscow

LD0806212088 Moscow TASS in English 1655 GMT 8 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 8 TASS—Cardinal Agostino Casaroli, secretary of state of the Vatican, today arrived in the Soviet capital on the invitation of the Russian Orthodox Church.

The head of the Vatican delegation will attend the festivities to mark the one thousand years of Christianity in Russia. He was met by Metropolitan of Minsk and Belorussia Filaret who is the chairman of the Department of the Church External Relations, and other religious leaders. Konstantin Kharchev, chairman of the Council for the Affairs of Religions at the USSR Council of Ministers, was among the welcoming party.

Gorbachev Meets Casaroli

AU1306100888 Paris AFP in English 1007 GMT 13 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow, June 13 (AFP)—Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev held talks Monday at the Kremlin with Vatican Secretary of State Cardinal Agostino Casaroli, who is currently attending the 1,000th anniversary celebrations of Russian Christianity here.

Asked about a possible visit by Pope John Paul II, Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, who also attended the meeting, said: "The time will come. We have important plans".

Mr. Gorbachev told reporters there "there still must be a lot to do" before such a visit could be made.

Cardinal Casaroli, was to hand Mr. Gorbachev a message from the pope.

Talks were expected to center on relations between Moscow and the Vatican and the position of the Catholic Uniate Ukrainian Church, which accepts the authority of the pope but which does not have official recognition here.

Finnish Defense Minister Continues Visit

LD0906010488 Moscow International Service in Finnish 1430 GMT 8 Jun 88

[Text] Finnish Defense Minister Norrback, who is here as a guest of Soviet Defense Minister Yazov, today visited the Air Force garrison in Kubinka, where he acquainted himself with the aircraft. Today he also visited the (?Frunze) war academy.

Yazov Sees Off Norrback

LD0906145688 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 9 Jun 88

[Text] Finnish Defense Minister Norrback, who is in the Soviet Union on an official visit, today left Moscow on a tour of the country. At the airport, he was seen off by Army General Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR Defense Minister, and other officials.

Demichev Receives Finnish Envoy's Credentials

LD0806033688 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1430 GMT 7 Jun 88

[Text] Today Heikki Talvitie, ambassador of the Finnish Republic, presented his credentials in the Kremlin to Petr Nilovich Demichev. Receiving them, the first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium expressed sincere pleasure at the greeting and conveyed to the Finnish president, government, and people the good wishes of the Soviet leadership.

Official Briefs Finnish President on Summit

LD1006132288 Moscow TASS in English 2003 GMT 9 Jun 88

[Text] Helsinki June 9 TASS—Finnish President Mauno Koivisto today received Andrey Aleksandrov-Agentov, a representative of the Soviet leadership, counsellor at the USSR Foreign Ministry, who informed the president about the Soviet evaluation of the outcome of the Moscow summit meeting between the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan.

Expressing gratitude for the information, President Koivisto underscored the tremendous significance of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. It is highly important, he said, that the Soviet-U.S. dialogue is developing on a stable basis. People in Finland commend the contribution to this made by Mikhail Gorbachev.

The president noted that the positive factor from the point of view of Finland was that negotiations were in progress between the USSR and the United States on reducing the number of cruise missiles, including sea-based missiles, and also consultations on the activity of the navies.

Finland, Koivisto said, unreservedly supports the proposals for the disengagement of troops in Europe and creating on the continent zones free of nuclear and chemical weapons. Finland is also strongly interested in a ban on chemical weapons and is ready to give assistance within its powers in solving some questions pertaining to organising technical monitoring of compliance with an agreement in this field.

UK Minister Sees Increasing Cultural Ties

LD0806055988 Moscow TASS in English 2243 GMT 8 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 8 TASS—Richard Luce, British minister of state for the arts, has expressed satisfaction with growing cultural contacts with the Soviet Union.

Speaking at a news conference in Moscow today, he pointed out that, to tell the truth, more groups arrive in Britain from the USSR than Britain sends to the Soviet Union. He said the problem was discussed during a meeting with Vasiliy Zakharov, minister of culture of the USSR. The conversation was a frank one and I am sure quite useful to both sides, Mr Luce said.

The British minister arrived in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the USSR Ministry of Culture. Agreement on the Soviet Union's participation in the Sotheby auction where pictures by Soviet avant-gardists of the 1920-30's will be represented, and on exchanges between the National Museum of Britain and Soviet repositories. [sentence as received]

It was pointed out at the news conference that British ballet enthusiasts are in for quite a number of guest performances.

The ballet troupe of the Kirov Theatre (Leningrad) will perform there in July after a 18-year interval. Moscow's ballet theatre will arrive, too. Its programme will include Petr Tchaikovsky's ballet Swan Lake.

The Bolshoy Theatre of Belorussia is also preparing for guest performances in Britain.

Soviet Government Greets Danish Premier

LD0606075488 Moscow TASS in English 0747 GMT 6 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 6 TASS—The Soviet Government has congratulated Poul Schluter on his appointment as prime minister of Denmark. "We express confidence that the relations of traditional goodneighbourly cooperation between the USSR and Denmark will be further developed for the benefit of our peoples, in the interests of international peace and security," says a telegram by the USSR Council of Ministers published here today.

Academician on Elimination of Berlin Wall

AU0906094288 Bonn DIE WELT in German 9 Jun 88 p 8

["Nea." article: "The Wall Will Have To Disappear"]

[Text] Bonn—The fact that a Soviet professor—speaking to German journalists as an official guest at the Soviet Embassy in Bonn—calls the wall and the barbed wire at the GDR border the "remnants and legacy of the cold war," which "will have to disappear in time," demonstrates, as hardly any other event, that perestroyka and glasnost are beginning to become an official part of Soviet foreign policy.

Prof Vyacheslav Dashichev, head of the Foreign Policy Department of the Moscow Academy of Sciences, was not unknown when he arrived in Cologne and Bonn. His article in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, in which he accused Soviet foreign policy before Gorbachev, with its striving for worldwide hegemony, of being largely responsible for East-West tensions, has caused international excitement. To date, however, he has been considered an outsider, whose theses are not yet representative of the Kremlin's policy.

Dashichev himself did not provide a clear answer to this question. In fluent German and obviously slightly self-conscious because of this role to which he is not yet accustomed, he called his article "my modest contribution to East-West understanding." He did not repeat the accusations against foreign policy prior to Gorbachev in this form, but neither did he withdraw them. Soviet foreign policy is now being "humanized" and "linked more closely with ethics," he said.

With regard to some questions, the professor remained cautious. Of course, arms deliveries to Third World countries have to be stopped within the framework of a humanized foreign policy, not unilaterally, however, but only as a result of multilateral agreements. Gorbachev is not in a crisis with his policy. This is exaggeration—"but, of course, we did not expect such difficulties." Nevertheless, the leaders of the Soviet Union are "united and determined to carry perestroyka to its end." Thus, this policy is irrevocable, Dashichev said.

He clearly noted that the so-called Brezhnev Doctrine is obsolete. "With regard to accepting the new policy, there is no limited sovereignty of the socialist states; this also applies to other fields." And he added cautiously: "This is the present position of Soviet policy." There was also a qualifying addition to his almost sensational remarks on the wall and the barbed wire: In order to facilitate their elimination, "corresponding security and economic relations have to be ensured" first. Dashichev added that he is not a prophet. The elimination of the wall is conceivable only as a result of an "evolutionary development."

The professor thinks that the problems of the new policy are, in particular, the following: At present, successes are visible mainly in the intellectual and psychological area. Economic success, on the other hand, will perhaps emerge only at the end of the century. Gorbachev himself knows about the inherent danger. This will be one of the most important topics at the all-union conference on 28 June, Dashichev said.

Besides, Dashichev does not think that perestroyka has exacerbated the nationality problem. Tensions such as those occurring now in Armenia and Azerbaijan were only hidden before. In the future, the ethnic groups will have to be granted much more independence, Dashichev noted.

Latin America & Caribbean

Gromyko Receives Peruvian Parliamentarians

PM1006155588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jun 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Reception in the Kremlin"]

[Text] The most unexpected epithets are often used abroad to express a positive attitude toward Soviet restructuring. Restructuring is the most powerful Soviet rocket. This comparison was used by Alfonso Ramos, Peruvian senator from the ruling Aprista Party, during a meeting in the Kremlin 8 June between A.A. Gromyko and a Peruvian parliamentary delegation.

The chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium received this delegation, which is led by Jorge Losada Stambura, president of the National Congress, president of the Peruvian Senate, and prominent specialist in agriculture and constitutional law.

At the guests' proposal, the conversation began with an exchange of information on the situation in each country. J. Losada talked about how Peru is striving to strengthen its national independence. This is not easy under present conditions. The country has an enormous foreign debt—$14 billion. Certain strata of the population have close ties with U.S. capital. Economic problems are made worse by rampant organized terrorism.

Of course, the country needs a development program, but the government does not have the resources to create such a program on the scale it would like. It would be possible, in particular, to rely on mining wealth, but the working of mines by foreign imperialist companies is conducted so that all extracted raw material is basically exported dirt cheap.

As far as the foreign debt is concerned, it is impossible to repay it and so a political solution must be found.

Senator Sandro Mariategui said that, in his view, the tragedy of a considerable proportion of the country's territory is that there is an acute water shortage. The implementation of the irrigation project that is being discussed with Soviet representatives could greatly change the situation.

Senator Edmundo Murrugara spoke about how there are plans to form autonomous territories in multiethnic Peru. This will help to preserve unity but at the same time boost the development of individual autonomous regions' economy and culture. We will be helped in this respect by the enormous experience of the Soviet Union, where the solution of the national problem is an example, the senator said.

The Peruvians' ancient ancestors, the Incas, had three commandments: Do not be lazy, do not tell lies, and do not steal. We believe that these fundamentals of our ancestors' everyday philosophy must be preserved today.

In our opinion, in the eyes of the United States—which lies to the north of us—Latin America must seem a disunited, weak south. Under these conditions we must definitely unite. We do not want to be like sardines before a shark.

A.A. Gromyko spoke about how the Soviet people are resolving the majestic task set by the party. Restructuring means accelerating society's economic and social development, using the latest scientific and technological achievements. The current task is to make people's life still better. For this to happen we must work and think in a new way.

Criticism will without a doubt be broadly mounted at the forthcoming 19th all-union party conference. It will help us to arm ourselves with an even better knowledge of the situation and develop our understanding of how we must continue. The party is focusing society on active, intensive work. The restructuring tasks can and must be solved. The people as a whole are sure that our cause is right. Consequently all the transformations now being made are imbued with our sense of optimism, although there are still a great many shortcomings.

We are divided by the ocean, A.A. Gromyko said, but the Soviet people extend the hand of friendship to the Peruvian people across its expanses.

The two sides exchanged opinions on international problems. J. Losada dwelt on the problems troubling Latin America. Peru is categorically opposed to outside interference in Nicaragua's internal affairs and believes that this country's people must themselves decide how to live.

The head of the delegation also related the measures being taken by Latin American countries to accelerate the process of their integration.

A.A. Gromyko said that the Latin American countries display principle in their struggle against outside interference, whatever form it may take. The Soviet Union fully supports this policy. We reiterate this when it is a question of the situation in the Caribbean basin region and around Nicaragua. The USSR rates highly the stand taken by the Contadora Group and its support group, including Peru. Their main aim is to remove the tense situation in Central America by political means.

Any attempts to cast aspersions on the Soviet Union's policy in this region must be regarded as lies and as a desire to deceive people. We support Nicaragua in its policy of independence. At the same time the line taken by the United States is a flagrant violation of the principles enshrined in the UN Charter and other international documents. This appraisal was made by M.S. Gorbachev in his talks with R. Reagan and is a fair one.

A.A. Gromyko spoke about the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. The main outcome was the further progress made in arms limitation and reduction. Ratification documents were exchanged in Moscow, thereby bringing into force the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. So the movement toward a world free of nuclear weapons has really begun.

The guests were briefed on the Soviet Union's stand regarding a solution of the explosive situation in the Near East, its views on a political settlement of the Iran-Iraq conflict, and the situation around Afghanistan and in Afghanistan itself since the signing of the Geneva agreements.

Bilateral relations were examined during the conversation. The sides discussed the potential for increasing trade and developing economic ties, including in the

fishing industry and the working of Peruvian deposits of several types of mineral desposits. Particular attention was devoted to the expansion of parliamentary exchanges.

The conversation proceeded in a businesslike, friendly atmosphere.

Delegation Ends Visit

LD0906141488 Moscow TASS in English 0713 GMT 9 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 9 TASS—A delegation of Peruvian MP's led by Jorge Losada Stambura, president of the National Congress and of the Senate of Peru, left Moscow today after an official visit at the invitation of the Supreme Soviet (Parliament) of the USSR.

Talks 'Very Constructive'

PA1206185588 Moscow in Spanish to Latin America 2300 GMT 11 Jun 88

[Report by announcer Luis Morales and correspondent Mikhail Tijov on 2-9 June visit to the USSR by Peruvian Senate President Jorge Losada]

[Text] [Tijov] Dear listeners, our attention was centered this week on Soviet-Peruvian relations, was it not, Luis?

[Morales] Yes, a Peruvian Congress delegation headed by Senate and Congress President Jorge Losada visited the USSR 2-9 June.

[Tijov] In our daily programs, we reported on the visits and activities of the delegation in our country, but today we want to again discuss bilateral relations.

[Morales] We should note that the delegation's agenda has been quite hectic, covering various activities. In addition to Moscow, the delegation visited Vilnius, capital of the Soviet Republic of Lithuania; the Kaunas region, of the same republic; and then traveled to Leningrad, where they learned of the activities of the local state organizations and visited industrial enterprises, agricultural farms, museums, and theaters.

[Tijov] The delegation was received by Andrey Gromyko, president of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. After the meeting, Jorge Losada stated:

[Begin Losada recording] Mr Gromyko has shown us a great distinction. He has given us 2 and 1/4 hours of his time to engage in a frank, friendly, and democratic dialogue. We have frankly discussed the problems of Peru, of the USSR, and of the interrelation of the countries of the world. In sum, we made a general review of everything that is of interest to politicians, especially those of us in the Soviet and Peruvian parliaments. We believe it was a very constructive meeting. [end recording]

[Tijov] Luis, I am holding the joint Soviet-Peruvian communique on the visit by the delegation. Let us read one of the paragraphs.

[Morales] Yes, of course. On discussing Soviet-Peruvian relations, both parties expressed their satisfaction with their increased development. They reiterated their willingness to contribute through all means toward expanding and strengthening the friendly bilateral ties.

[Tijov] The ties are based on the principles of sovereign equality, noninterference in domestic affairs, and mutual benefit.

[Morales] Regarding Soviet-Peruvian relations, the head of the delegation stated at a news conference: We must say we attach great importance to these relations and the need to strengthen and intensify them, because we believe the USSR, as a world power, is in a position to provide technical and financial assistance in different fields of national development. We also believe we have products to offer to the USSR. We seek to increase and intensify our trade and sell them our semimanufactured or manufactured products, minerals, fish, textiles, and foodstuffs produced through our highly developed techniques. We view these relations favorably and believe they must be enhanced as much as possible, no longer in a rhetorical, but in an actual and pragmatic manner.

[Tijov] Luis, at the end of the communique mentioned above, both parties stressed the importance of Soviet-Peruvian political dialogue and the contacts between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Peruvian Congress, which have contributed greatly to increasing mutual understanding and strengthening friendship and cooperation between the Soviet and Peruvian peoples.

Afghan President Visits Cuba, Meets With Castro

LD1006154188 Moscow TASS in English 1243 GMT 10 Jun 88

[Text] Havana June 10 TASS—Official Cuban-Afghan talks have started here. A Cuban delegation at the talks is led by Fidel Castro, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba, chairman of the State Council and the Council of Ministers of the Republic, and an Afghan delegation—by President Najibullah of the Republic of Afghanistan, general secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan.

During the talks held in a friendly atmosphere the Afghan leader spoke in detail about the situation in the country and the development of the national reconciliation process. Afghanistan and the Soviet Union strictly abide by all the provisions of the Geneva accords, while other signatories to the accords violate them now and again, he pointed out.

Fidel Castro said that the Cuban people firmly supported the revolutionary process in Afghanistan. He supported the Geneva accords and expressed high appreciation of the efforts exerted by the Afghan leadership with a view to establishing peace in an extremely difficult situation.

Participants in the talks discussed questions connected with a further development of bilateral relations and prospects of cooperation between the peoples and governments of the two countries.

Najibullah Receives Award

LD1006154788 Moscow TASS in English 1423 GMT 10 Jun 88

[Text] Havana June 10 TASS—Afghan President Najibullah has been presented here with the Order of Jose Marti, the highest Cuban distinction.

Speaking in an interview with the newspaper GRANMA, the Afghan leader, who is here on an official visit of friendship, stressed the need for unfailing abidance by the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan.

It is only goodwill and political integrity on the part of the signatories that are needed for the accords' realization, he said.

After noting that his government has held a series of national reconciliation talks with most diverse opposition forces, Najibullah expressed the hope that the opposition will help further the reconciliation process.

He pointed to much attention given to the problems of refugees returning to Afghanistan and voiced regret at the fact that Pakistan has not take any steps to this day to ensure their unimpeded home-coming.

The Afghan president described his country's relationship with the Soviet Union as historically and traditionally friendly.

The USSR, he stressed, has remained a guarantor of the interests of the Afghan people.

"Our bilateral relations cover the political, economic, socil and cultural fields," Najibullah said. "It can be said with confidence that friendship between our countries has a bright future and that Afghanistan, as a nonaligned and neutral country acting in accordance with its national interests, is for consolidating our friendly rapport with the Soviet Union ever further."

Speaking of his recent tour of a number of Asian nations, the Afghan president said that his country seeks to develop ties with all the other states in the region and expressed confidence that his visit has helped further this aim and strengthen Afghanistan's international positions.

Najibullah spoke highly of Cuba's solidarity with the Afghan revolution and expressed himself in favor of further consolidating friendly relations between the people of the two countries.

Official Discusses Cooperation With Cuba

PA0906181088 Moscow in Spanish to Cuba 0100 GMT 9 Jun 88

[Text] In an interview granted to Radio Moscow, Aleksandr Kachanov, first deputy chairman of the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations, described the negotiations between the Soviet and Cuban intergovernmental commissions for economic, technical, and scientific cooperation as successful and efficient. Aleksandr Kachanov participated in these negotiations. He said:

[Begin recording] [Kachanov speaking in Russian with simultaneous Spanish translation] It would take us hours to list all the matters discussed by the intergovernmental commission; therefore, I will only mention a few.

First, we analyzed the results of economic, technical, and scientific cooperation between the USSR and Cuba in 1987. We were pleased to see that the exchange of merchandise between our two countries increased by 2 percent in 1987 when compared to 1986. The volume of technical cooperation grew 5 percent. In 1987, 15 of the 17 projects scheduled for completion went into operation. The first phase of the Havana thermonuclear plant was completed. This plant will be the largest of its kind in Havana and has already produced approximately 250 million kw of electricity. At the Hermanos Diaz refinery in Santiago de Cuba, installations that will produce 1.5 tons of oil and [word indistinct] a year were also completed. The first installations of the Punta Gorda nickel factory and the Havana and Holguin printing plants have also been completed, and 235 km of power lines have been laid. Our main goals were the completion of the thermonuclear plant in Juragua and the Nuclear Investigations Center.

[Reporter] What about the projects that have been completed?

[Kachanov] An agreement establishing the juridical guidelines and norms for direct contacts between production enterprises was signed during the intergovernment commission's meeting. Within the framework of these relations, there is great interest in attaining increased and efficient cooperation, especially to enjoy the potential benefits of Soviet-Cuban cooperation, achieve the desired quality production levels, and increase the enterprises' yield.

[Reporter] You have mentioned the new forms of cooperation and context of the relations between production enterprises. Please give us more details about this.

[Khachanov] Within this framework, we must also bear in mind the mutual decision to create various mixed enterprises on Cuban territory. Interesting proposals were presented by the Soviet and Cuban representatives, and we intend to review them during the 2d half of 1988. It is also appropriate to mention that we are not actively working as we should to attain this goal.

[Reporter] Guidelines to develop Soviet-Cuban economic relations until 2005 were approved during the negotiations. Can you reveal the contents of this document?

[Khachanov] The current state of economic, technical, and scientific relations between the Soviet Union and the Republic of Cuba, and the two countries' broad and efficient participation in international socialist work, need a coordinating economic policy and a qualitative reorganization of their cooperation. The guidelines to develop mutual cooperation until 2005 were approved with this goal in mind. The document specifies the strategic importance of the agro-industrial, energy and fuel, and metallurgical sectors. The document also includes the guidelines for cooperation in the machinery, electronic, light industry, and food industries. In addition to our traditional cooperation in the sugar, nickel, and oil sectors, efforts will be renewed in the next 5 years for cooperation in the electronic and microbiology sectors. All our efforts in the next few years will be exerted for the construction and enlargement of projects currently being built in Cuba with Soviet aid. These projects will include the Camariocas nickel plant, the Cienfuegos oil refinery, the Matanzas Bay oil terminal for large ships, and others. [end recording]

Special Envoy Briefs Ortega on Summit Results

LD1006143588 Moscow TASS in English 1340 GMT 10 Jun 88

[Text] Managua June 10 TASS—Daniel Ortega, coordinator of the Executive Commission of the national leadership of the Sandinist National Liberation Front and President of Nicaragua, received here Andrey Urnov, deputy head of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee and a special representative of the Soviet leadership.

During their conversation the Nicaraguan president was informed of the results of the Soviet-American summit in Moscow. Daniel Ortega pointed out that the summit, a major international event, was of great importance for the whole of humanity. The Soviet side reiterated solidarity with the Nicaraguan people upholding their sovereignty, independence and the right to develop economy along the path chosen by them. Support was expressed for the efforts of the Nicaraguan Government aimed at achieving a just political settlement in Central America on the basis of the agreements reached in Guatemala and Sapoa.

The meeting was attended by Miguel d'Escoto, minister of foreign affairs of Nicaragua, and V. Vyalyas, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the USSR to Nicaragua.

Lomeyko Briefs Brazilian Officials on Summit

LD1106084388 Moscow TASS in English 0721 GMT 11 Jun 88

[Text] Brasilia June 11 TASS—Roberto Costa de Abreu Sodre, Brazilian minister of foreign affairs, on an instruction from the president of Brazil, received Ambassador at Large Vladimir Lomeyko, special envoy of the Soviet leadership, who informed him of the results of the Moscow talks between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and President Ronald Reagan of the United States.

The Brazilian minister highly appreciated the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, referring to it as an important step on the way to nuclear disarmament, to stronger international stability, and to the establishment of a climate of trust in the world. He emphasised that the results of the talks went far beyond the framework of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States and met the vital interests of the entire international community.

Roberto Sodre spoke out in favour of an active continuation of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue and expressed hope for the achievement of new specific results in the cause of producing nuclear and conventional arms, banning chemical weapons, and settling regional conflicts.

The minister pointed out that Brazil attached special importance to close interrelationship between disarmament and a solution to development problems, and, for its part, was prepared to promote efforts in that direction in every way.

Vladimir Lomeyko also had a detailed exchange of views with other Brazilian political figures on all aspects of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

Political & Social

More Unrest Reported in Azerbaijan 11 Jun

Dissident Cited

LD1206075188 Hamburg DPA in German 0556 GMT 12 Jun 88

[Excerpts] Moscow (DPA)—According to civil rights activists in Moscow, there were riots in Baku, the capital of the Soviet Republic of Azerbaijan, directed against the Armenian population on Friday evening. This involved several deaths, dissident Valeriy Senderov reported on Sunday. Senderov heads the Soviet human rights group of the International Society for Human Rights in Frankfurt. The ringleaders of the riots were armed with daggers as they moved through the city, he said. They called out: "We are repeating Sumgait." Zenderov bases his remarks on information from Armenians in Baku. [passage omitted]

According to Senderov, the situation is particularly tense in the urban residential areas of Armjanakent and Chutor [names as received]. The authorities had tried, thus far without success, to implement measures to protect the population. [passage omitted]

Tanks Move Into Baku

NC1206123288 Paris AFP in English 1137 GMT 12 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow, June 12 (AFP)—A policeman and several Armenians were killed Saturday in Baku, the Azerbaijani capital, after anti-Armenian demonstrations throughout the city lasting into the night, an Armenian told a crowd of nationalist Armenians demonstrating here Sunday. Levon Gambayan said at a rally at Moscow's Armenian cemetery, where hundreds of banner-waving Armenians had gathered to find out about the situation in the strife-torn neighboring southern republics of Azerbaijan and Armenia, that his aunt living in Baku had told him about the deaths by telephone.

The circumstances in which the deaths occurred were not clear, and official confirmation could not immediately be obtained. An official at Azerbaijani television in Baku told AFP Sunday that demonstrations had taken place Saturday, but denied that anyone had been killed.

Mr. Gambayan said that according to his aunt, Moslem Azeris armed with knives had Saturday marched through the Baku metro calling on the Christian Armenians to "come out." Mr. Gambayan is an Armenian militant from Moscow campaigning for the Azerbaijani region of Nagorno-Karabakh to be transferred to Armenia. He is often at the regular Sunday demonstrations staged outside the Armenian church here to press the Armenians' demand for the Armenian-dominated region to be attached to Armenia.

Late Saturday, tanks moved into Armenian districts of Baku and helicopters were flying overhead, according to Mr. Gambayan. He said that the Azeris had gathered shouting "death to the Armenians", and "we will kill you like a dog." They also praised the "heroes of Sumgait"—the 80 people currently standing trial for killing 32 people, mostly Armenians, in riots from February 27-29 in Sumgait, an industrial city north of Baku.

Korion Nagapetyan, another Armenian militant, said he had been told Saturday by sources in Baku that "it's a frightening situation" there. "They want all the Armenians out of Azerbaijan," he said.

Yalastyan Hambartsoum, a representative of the Karabakh Committee, a dissolved nationalist pressure group formed in Yerevan, the Armenian capital, told the demonstration Sunday that before he arrived in Moscow Saturday he had learned of "many injured" in Baku in the last few weeks as the inter-ethnic unrest continued. He attributed the deterioration in the situation in the two republics to remarks made by Kremlin Number Two Yegor Ligachev, who had said when presiding over the replacement of the Azerbaijani Communist Party leader on May 21 that the Nagorno-Karabakh issue was settled. "Down with Ligachev" slogans are now frequently heard at the Armenian demonstrations in Yerevan and Moscow, and were partly responsible for the three-week old strike in Stepanakert, the main town of Nagorno-Karabakh, which is still continuing.

Mr. Hambartsoum said that 10,000 people were gathering every day in Yerevan to call for the transfer of Nagorno-Karabakh to Armenia. He added that seven people were continuing a hunger strike in the city's Opera Square in support of the demand. When he announced to the crowd that the Nagorno-Karabakh issue would be discussed at next Wednesday's session of the local parliament in Yerevan, the Armenians present cheered and applauded wildly. To general applause, he also condemned the official Soviet press for "not writing a single word" about the Yerevan Supreme Soviet decision to discuss Nagorno-Karabakh.

Asked by AFP what the Armenians would do if the Supreme Soviet rejected the Armenians' territorial demand, he said: "They will say yes. The whole republic is with us." But he noted that for the republican boundaries to be changed, the Consitution states that the consent of the republic involved—in this case Azerbaijan—must be obtained. Mr. Hambartsoum, recognising that the Azerbaijani Supreme Soviet was sure to reject the Armenians' demand, said that the Armenian militants now wanted the Constitution amended so that Azerbaijan's permission would not be required.

Also at the cemetery, a Russian, Vadim Malakhov, read out an open letter to the Communist Party Central Committee expressing the support of non-Armenians for their cause. He announced he would collect signatures outside a church in central Moscow later in the day.

The priest of the Armenian church, Archimandrite Tikhon, appealed to the demonstrators to be calm, saying that the authorities had only permitted the regular meetings at the cemetery to discuss the Armenians' territorial claim "and nothing more."

Anti-Gorbachev Slogans Shouted

LD1206125888 Hamburg DPA in German 1138 GMT 12 Jun 88

[Excerpts] Moscow (DPA)—The continuous tensions between Christian Armenians and Muslim Azarbaijanis in the Caucasian Soviet republics have again become acute. Armenians who had traveled to Moscow and citizens' rights activists reported on Sunday that a militia member and several Armenians were killed in Baku, capital of the Azerbaijan SSR, on Saturday evening after an anti-Armenian demonstration. At a protest gathering of several hundred Armenians at the Armenian cemetery in Moscow it was said that many people had been injured.

The demonstrators left no doubt that they would not retract their demand to unite the autonomous region of Nagorno-Karabakh with Armenia. Moscow has thus far bluntly refused the demand. To continued applause, they adopted the slogan that the Armenians would fight for their cause "until victory." "Death or justice," the people shouted. The fulfillment of the demand was the "touchstone for perestroyka." Armenians have been meeting at the cemetery regularly since the start of the unrest in February. It was said that the Supreme Soviet of Armenia will meet on 15 June to discuss the demand. [passage omitted]

According to the Armenians, the situation in Baku, Yerevan, and Nagorno-Karabakh is "very tense." There was a general strike in Nagorno-Karabakh. The demonstrators vehemently accused Number Two man in the Kremlin and party chief ideologist Yegor Ligachev of refusing to let the Armenians' demand at the Central Committee in Baku be discussed by the Armenian parliament. Soviet media and the party newspaper PRAVDA were also attacked as having aggravated the situation by false or inflammatory rpeorting.

PRAVDA, the party newspaper, reported on Friday that unrest was continuing in Nagorno-Karabakh autonomous region and that the party leadership there no longer had the situation under control. Tens of thousands of people were marching daily to the center of the regional capital, Stepanakert, demanding that Armenia annex Nagorno-Karabakh. According to the Armenians in Moscow, tens of thousands of people demonstrate daily in Opera Square in the center of Yerevan. Several students began a hunger strike there on 4 June.

The Armenians reported that Azerbaijanis in Baku had shouted slogans such as: "We are repeating Sumgait again" and "long live the heroes of Sumgait." In Sumgait, some 30 km from Baku, 32 persons were killed in an anti-Armenian pogrom at the end of February.

In demonstrations in Baku, Azerbaijanis had protested against Armenian annexation of Nagorno-Karabakh, civil rights activists in Moscow said. There had been slogans such as: "Out of Azerbaijan with the representatives of other nationalities." This had been directed not only against Armenians, but also against Russians and other nationalities. There had also been "very many insulting slogans" against Kremlin boss Mikhail Gorbachev and his wife.

Meetings Discuss Events

NC1306074588 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1730 GMT 12 Jun 88

[Text] [Words indistinct] Meetings and [word indistinct] continue at the Theater Square, during which participants are calling for the inclusion of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast in the Armenian SSR. (?The participants) are demanding hat the [word indistinct] workers' demands for national (?self-determination) be fulfilled and that the [word indistinct] of Sumgait be respected.

Armenians Call 3-Day Strike

NC1206211388 Paris AFP in English 2104 GMT 12 Jun 88

[Excerpt] Moscow, June 12 (AFP)—Half a million Armenians held a meeting Sunday in their capital of Yerevan and voted to strike for three days from Monday to back their demands for the return to Armenia of the disputed region of Nagorno-Karabakh, Armenian sources said.

Armenian militant Movses Gordissan told AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE in a telephone interview from Yerevan that the three-day general strike could be extended on Wednesday if the Armenian parliament, which opens a special session that day, fails to vote for self determination for Nagorno-Karabakh. Mr. Gordissan said that Sunday's mass meeting lasted three hours with loud cheers greeting those speakers who supported the strike and derisive whistles those who opposed it.

Security forces made no attempt to break up the meeting, other dissident sources said. [passage omitted]

General Strike in Yerevan

AU1306080388 Paris AFP in English 0802 GMT 13 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow, June 13 (AFP)—The Armenian capital of Yerevan and the principal towns of the Soviet republic were brought to a halt by a general strike Monday, an official of the Armenian Communist Party daily KOMMUNIST said. The strike, following a demonstration by

hundreds of thousands of people in Yerevan on Sunday, is linked with Armenian demands for the return of the Nagorno-Karabakh region, which has a majority Armenian population but is administratively part of Azerbaijan.

Igor Muradyan, an official of the daily KOMMUNIST and a former member of the banned Armenian Karabakh Committee, said in telephone interview that no public transport was operating in Yerevan. He said the strike was prompted by a further rejection by the authorities of the Armenians' demands at a meeting Thursday of the Secretariat of the Soviet Communist Party Central Commitee. The meeting, chaired by Soviet deputy leader Yegor Ligachev, was also attended by the first secretaries of the party in Armenia, Azerbaijan and Nagorno-Karabakh.

Grigoryants on Yerevan Strike

LD1306100088 Hamburg DPA in German 0840 GMT 13 Jun 88

[Excerpts] Moscow (DPA)—According to civil rights activists in Moscow, a 3-day strike is in force in Armenia as of Monday. Thousands of Armenians were on the streets in Yerevan, the Armenian capital, where work had been stopped, Sergey Grigoryants, head of the unofficial publication GLASNOST, stated in Moscow. Mass demonstrations and strikes took place there in February too.

Factories were idle in Leninakan, Idzhevan, and Kirovakan, because people were on the streets in the capital, Grigoryants reported, basing himself on sources from Armenia. On Sunday evening there had already been a rally with tens of thousands of people. The strike might possibly even last until the start of the party conference at the end of June, for which 5,000 delegates are expected in Moscow. [passage omitted]

The Armenians' call for the annexation of Nagorno-Karabakh was also stressed at the mass gathering on Sunday evening, Grigoryants said. At the same time, condemnation of the pogroms of Sumgait as genocide was demanded, together with official court action against the perpetrators. [passage omitted]

Armenian Supreme Soviet To Discuss Karabakh

NC1006112388 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1730 GMT 9 Jun 88

[Text] A group of deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR have submitted to the Presidium of the republic's Supreme Soviet a motion to introduce for consideration by the session of the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR the question of the resolution adopted by the extraordinary session of the oblast Soviet of People's Deputies of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast of the Azerbaijan SSR on 20 February 1988 to petition to the Supreme Soviets of the Azerbaijan SSR and the Armenian SSR to transfer the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast from the structure of the Azerbaijan SSR to that of the Armenian SSR. The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR has announced that this issue will be submitted for consideration during the forthcoming session of the republic's Supreme Soviet.

The Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium appeals to all the republic's citizens to display political maturity, self-restraint, and sagacity—something which is in the interests of our multi-national country and of all the peoples of the Soviet Union. The fundamental gains of the workers of the Armenian SSR dictate that (?good) behavior be displayed everywhere. Only under conditions of order can all the public's demands be fully met; and it is by maintaining the normal rhythm that all the republic's accumulated issues can be objectively and circumspectly studied (?and solved).

Azerbaijan Bureau Adopts Decision on 'Situation'

NC1306135088 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1600 GMT 12 Jun 88

[Text] The Azerbaijan Communist Party Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast Party Committee Bureau has adopted a decision which seriously assesses the situation created by strikes in [word indistinct], industrial, construction, and transportation establishments and in organizations and a number of administrations in Stepanakert city and by illegal meetings and demonstrations.

The decision advises the Stepanakert Gorkom and raykoms to take the necessary political and organizational measures to obstruct these meetings and demonstrations. The decision (?warns) the leading officials of the party and soviet organs and those affiliated with the administrations, that the penalty for failing to achieve practical results and for resistance will range from [words indistinct] to expulsion from the CPSU ranks.

The bureau asks the Stepanakert gorkom and raykoms, party, soviet, and trade union functionaries, and social organizations to explain the [words indistinct] and harm of the [words indistinct] and to expose the individuals who have organized the demonstrations which have disrupted normalcy to (?a point of a crisis). Law enforcement entities were urged to launch administrative and criminal proceedings against the officials of economic organizations who have caused material losses to the state and against the provocateurs and [word indistinct], including those who have disrupted social law and order.

The decision drew particular attention to the need to obstruct the (?manifestation of nationalist feelings). The bureau strongly condemns the expulsion of people of other nationalities from work. The decision asserts that the party organizations should make a principled assessment of each such case. Mass media organs were advised to explain in depth to the masses the harm done to the reconstruction drive by acts of robbery.

Armenian, Azerbaijani Officials Discuss Measures

NC1306066588 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1600 GMT 9 Jun 88

[Text] The decision adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium on 23 March as a result of the appeal by the allied republics for measures to deal with incidents in Nagorno-Karabakh, Azerbaijan SSR, and Armenian SSR advised the state organs of the two allied republics to draft and implement effective measures to normalize the situation, prevent developments disrupting society, stop their recurrence, and consolidate and improve the fraternal relations between the peoples of the Azerbaijan SSR and Armenian SSR through every possible means, as required by the interests of the multinational Soviet Union. The measures called for have been drawn up, and a number of functionaries of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium have traveled to the Armenian SSR to discuss them.

Meanwhile, a number of functionaries of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium have arrived in Baku in accordance with a central plan to see how legislative bills are drawn up and (?put into effect) and to exchange views on the experience gained through the reconstruction efforts of the soviets under the new conditions in the country. The guests have visited a number of raykoms, industrial establishments, and cultural centers in Baku.

At the same time, measures are being implemented by various soviets near the Armenian SSR and Georgian SSR border areas to strengthen solidarity (?and cooperation) with their counterparts in the neighboring fraternal republics.

A group of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium functionaries who visited the Armenian SSR recently have returned to Baku.

Azerbaijan Party Chief Meets Writers, Artists

PM1006113588 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 26 May 88 pp 1, 3

[AZERINFORM report: "Serving the People, Taking an Active Part in Restructuring"]

[Excerpts] The creative intelligentsia has an important role in the processes of democratization and glasnost which are asserting themselves everywhere. By helping the party to implement restructuring, the creative intelligentsia has gained the opportunity to display its potential most fully. A profoundly committed, principled, and confidential discussion of the increased activity of leading writers and artists in socialist building at the new stage, during preparations for the 19th all-union party conference, took place at a meeting between A.Kh. Vezirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, and the leaders of the republic's creative unions and organizations. The meeting was held at the Azerbaijan Writers Union.

The idea of the cultural figures' lofty calling and equally high responsibility was the theme of the meeting. It was stressed in the course of the conversation that we must all serve the people and implement our party's main principle—everything in the name of man, everything for man's well-being—in deeds rather than in words, a principle that is sometimes not always observed in practice. We must constantly remember this; this basic tenet must determine our entire work.

Having warmly thanked Azerbaijan's literary and art figures for their contribution to the cause of restructuring, A.Kh. Vezirov also pointed out that this work must be given a new boost. Today it is extremely important to implement the ideas of social justice and show their invincibility and the triumph of truth, however difficult it sometimes is for them to gain a foothold. In this situation honesty, truthfulness, and sincerity must also be indispensable for artists' creative work, so that the people for whom you are working believe you and share your views based on clear party criteria. Masters of culture must be deeply involved with the people, at the heart of life. By reacting with interest to everything going on around them they must foresee the phenomena ripening in society and take preventive social measures to counter those of them that may have an unfavorable impact on our life.

The meeting held 7 May at the CPSU Central Committee with the leaders of the mass media, ideological establishments, and creative unions pointed out that the party leadership needs this kind of advice. A policy lacking a scientific nature is doomed to vacillation and error. But a policy that is not enriched with moral fiber is equally detrimental. [passage omitted]

Speaking about the upcoming 19th all-union party conference, the meeting's participants sharply focused attention on the question of selecting candidates for election as delegates to this forum. Active Communists and ardent supporters of restructuring whose ideological convictions and wealth of experience will enable them to make decisions on vitally important problems of our society must be sent to the conference. The republic's cultural figures will also name their most worthy candidates.

The meeting devoted attention to the situation in and around Nagorny- Karabakh. The CPSU Central Committee has expressed ardent gratitude for the firm and consistent standpoint reflected in party documents and in M.S. Gorbachev's Appeal to the Working People and Peoples of Azerbaijan and Armenia. Those present gave assurances that literary and cultural figures wholly and completely share these party tenets and will continue to abide by them.

High restraint and circumspection are necessary in the situation that has emerged in the sphere of inter-ethnic relations; we must not succumb to emotion but be guided by reason, proceeding from the great and noble

aims facing all the Soviet people at the present crucial phase of restructuring. That is why it is so important to normalize the situation and calmly and soberly look into the causes of the situation that has taken shape and consistently uphold the traditions of internationalism inherent in Azerbaijan's party organization and our republic's working people.

After noting that during this difficult time the republic's cultural figures have taken up a clear civic stance, Comrade Vezirov pointed to the need to further accelerate their involvement in fostering in broad strata of the population the spirit of Soviet patriotism, socialist internationalism, and the friendship and fraternity of the Soviet peoples. In this connection attention was drawn to the long-standing traditions of friendly ties between Azerbaijan's leading writers and artists and colleagues from the fraternal republics. These contacts take various forms and are implemented at diverse levels, including the personal level, but each such manifestation always has an artistic and a political effect, ultimately promoting the mutual enrichment of the fraternal peoples' cultures. These ties have been weakened recently. It is very important to strengthen them now and seek to ensure that they serve the cause of interethnic contacts in the best way possible. [passage omitted]

The conversation raised many topical questions to do with the republic's party and social life, morality and ecology, the preservation and proliferation of national traditions, the study of native and Russian languages, and the strengthening of ties among creative unions.

Glasnost is one of the mighty instruments of restructuring. There is now no monopoly on criticism, no zones prohibited to criticism, there is only a ban on half-truths, irresponsibility, and ignorance. But the main thing is for criticism to be constructive. Its aim is to pose questions in the interests of the people, of socialism, and of restructuring.

Leading writers and artists, the meeting's participants stated, see it as their duty to serve the people, and they will devote all their efforts and energy to the cause of restructuring.

Azerbaijan, Armenian Officials Interviewed

PM1006112588 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 10 Jun 88 p 3

[Interview with Shakkyul Aleskerov, first secretary of the Ordubadskiy Azerbaijan Communist Party Raykom, and Robert Megrabyan, first secretary of the Megrinskiy Armenian Communist Party Raykom, by special correspondent P. Yemelin under the rubric "International Relations: History and the Present Day": "We Have One Motherland"; date of interview not given—first paragraph is SELSKAYA ZHIZN introduction]

[Text] Ordubad-Megri—It takes about half an hour to drive from Ordubad to Megri. And so two friends, two party leaders—Shakkyul Aleskerov, first secretary of the Ordubadskiy Azerbaijan Communist Party Raykom, and Robert Megrabyan, first secretary of the Megrinskiy Armenian Communist Party Raykom, met again. There are many important, urgent concerns in both rayons. But today talk is about the most important thing—how to strengthen friendship between neighbors and what must be done today to improve international education.

Correspondent: It was with anguish and alarm that the entire country has followed the events in and around Nagorno-Karabakh. The waves of these events have, of course, reached here. Now we can look back and assess the situation soberly and calmly and draw lessons....

R. Megrabyan: Yes, the situation was indeed alarming but by no means explosive. People worked as usual although of course the psychological tension had its effect. However, not a single Azerbaijani family—and there are 4,000 Azerbaijanis, or 27 percent of the rayon's population, living here—left its home. Nor did the Armenians living in Ordubadskiy Rayon succumb to panic. In the light of these events when a flood of people poured in from their homes in Armenia and Azerbaijan, this was a fact which said a lot. It meant that the friendship between our rayons and the long-standing traditions of good-neighborliness had withstood their test of strength.

Sh. Aleskerov: A tree with deep roots does not fear the storm. I do not intend to idealize the past—there have been black days in our relations. But let's look at history objectively, from clear class positions. And we will see that our peoples, despite all the efforts of aggressors and exploiters to divide people along national lines, have always sought unity and fraternity. Friendship, equality, and mutual aid are great gains of Lenin's nationalities policy. No one will dispute that we have problems and substantial misunderstandings. But, as M.S. Gorbachev stressed in his Appeal to the Azerbaijani and Armenian peoples, we cannot consign the most serious questions of the people's destiny to the power of elemental forces and emotions.

Correspondent: We began by talking of the traditions, the historical roots of the friendship of the two peoples. That was probably right. Nonetheless, as the Karabakh events have shown, emotions, albeit not for long, gained the upper hand and led to dramatic excesses and casualties. What conclusion do you, the leaders of rayon party organizations, draw from this?

R. Megrabyan: Unfortunately our educational work failed to consider and even now does not always consider concepts like "national character" and "national mentality." Hence the troubles. Yet we cannot approach people of different nationalities with one and the same yardstick. Especially now that, in the atmosphere of glasnost and democracy, a marked increase in national self-awareness is to be observed. This, I repeat, must be considered in practice. People must know the history of their people, their native language and culture....

Sh. Aleskerov: National self-awareness existed before April 1985. It was simply that it was not mentioned so openly or specifically. Yet V.I. Lenin had warned that we should never treat the nationalities question in a formal, abstract manner. We proposed loud toasts in honor of equality and fraternity, yet unresolved problems accumulated beneath the fine slogans.

Nothing can justify the death of the people in Sumgait. At the same time I say with all responsibility that nothing similar could happen either in Ordubad or in Megri. You agree with me, Robert Rushanovich?

R. Megrabyan: Absolutely. Our good traditions, our understanding of the differences which have arisen, and our specific practical work are guarantees of that.

Correspondent: Nonetheless there was tension. Where did it come from?

R. Megrabyan: Rumors! Rumors which were spread by various "eyewitnesses" and inciters. What absurdities did they not utter! For instance, a rumor spread among our neighbors that because the people of Megri had not taken part in the Karabakh events the Yerevan people had deprived us of food. There was not a gramme of flour in Megri, it was said. And this was said at a time when our stores were full of flour.... In those alarming days any unpleasantness, any petty dispute between neighbors, was shifted to internation [mezhnatsionalnaya] ground and fueled emotions.

Sh. Aleskerov: I got a telephone call one day to say that an Armenian had been killed in some village. We raised the militia and drove there. In the village there was just one Armenian family and all its members were alive and well.... How many "alarm calls" of this kind we have had to check! We did this promptly and openly [glasno]. We had to defuse the situation without delay and dispel false rumors.

Correspondent: But there were incidents which went further than stories?

R. Megrabyan: That did happen. In February several windows in the Norashen-Baku passenger train were broken at Karchivan station. Shortly afterward a similar incident occurred in neighboring Zangelanskiy Rayon with the Kafan-Yerevan train. You can understand for yourselves that the facts are scandalous. We cannot sit idly by here, reassuring ourselves that everything will sort itself out. After all at least in the past 10 years there has not been a single crime committed on an internation basis on the territory or our rayons. Together with the Ordubadskiy Rayon people we took precautionary measures. We stepped up the escort for trains, organized a watch at the stations.... There were no more such extraordinary occurrences in our rayons.

Sh. Aleskerov: But rumors have still disturbed people and the situation has therefore remained complex. Day and night the Communists and raykom officials were kept busy. We were expected to provide trustworthy news and a frank discussion of the alarming events. We were trusted and we sought sincerely and with conviction to show that no differences could shake our friendship. At village meetings respected elders would get up and describe their Armenian friends and the hard times our peoples had experienced. You should have seen what a beneficial effect this had on people, especially young people.

R. Megrabyan: I fear I may be exaggerating, but in my view a considerable positive role was played in those crucial days by personal contacts between the rayons' leaders. Incidentally, this is also a long-standing, good tradition here. Our predecessors were good friends. For instance, Telman Dilanyan, who now works as an Armenian Communist Party Central Committee secretary, and Shamsaddin Khanbabayev—he heads the Nakhichevan City party organization.

Sh. Aleskerov: A friend in need is a friend indeed, as the old saying goes. And in those alarming days this saying it was as it were revealed to us anew. In early March, when passions were still heated, Akhmed Guseynov, leader of the rayon "Selkhoztekhnika," approached me. "The father of our friend from Megrinskiy Rayon, Sarkis Arakelyan, chairman of the Bagravar Kolkhoz, has died. We want to go to the funeral." Some 16 people, including Sayad Babayev, a school director from Gyanza village and an old friend of the deceased, traveled to Bagravar to share their grief. Afterward I asked them: "How were you received there? "As the closest of friends," they replied.

Correspondent: When I learned of this story which moves the human emotions, I wanted to meet Sarkis Arakelyan for myself. He is 35 years old, he has three children, two little girls and a small son Abgar, named in honor of his grandfather, Sarkis' father.

I shall never forget my meeting in the kolkhoz chairman's house. There were five of us—two Armenians, two Azerbaijanis, and myself, a Russian. We were speaking of business but the talk involuntarily turned to what was perturbing each one of us like a wound that would not heal. With manly restraint but unconcealed warmth Sarkis described his Ordubad friends. Gasan Guseynov, director of the Yu. Mamadaliyev sovkhoz, Rezvan Shirmamedov, chairman of the "Pervoye Maya" kolkhoz. "When I drive into Ordubad I know everyone and say 'salaam' to everyone," Sarkis smiled. He learned the Azerbaijani language from his father as a child. And what a remarkable man his late father was! A real worker, a frontline veteran. At Stalingrad he carried from the battlefield a gravely wounded fellow countryman, an Azerbaijani named Guseyn—he lives in Megrinskiy Rayon to this day.

R. Megrabyan: That is Soviet internationalism! Not a slogan, not a poster, but the very flesh, the very fabric of our life. I would merely add that there are very many examples of this strong personal friendship in our rayons. For instance, last summer, when there was a terrible drought, the hay was burned up as the result of a fire on the Imeni XVIII Partsezda Kolkhoz. Our neighbors did not have a large supply of hay either but they shared it fraternally with the Megrinskiy Rayon people. We have other reserves of economic cooperation. For instance, it is worth organizing joint trade fairs. We could share experience of developing the lease contract with which we link great prospects for developing the rayon. I will also make the following point. There is a shortage of manpower in Megri. And here too—and thanks to them!—the Ordubadskiy Rayon people are helping them. Every morning three vehicles full of people come to us from Ordubad. They work on construction sites and stockraising units. Incidentally, the Ordubadskiy Rayon people worked in our rayon even during the Karabakh events.

Correspondent: The school, the Komsomol—it is here that internationalists are formed. Young people's position is particularly important, after all it is a question of our future. How, according to your observations, did the young inhabitants of Megri and Ordubad react to the events around Nagorno-Karabakh?

Sh. Aleskerov: To be honest, I did not feel any difference in the feelings of people of the older generation and young people. Both believed that the eruption of emotions would pass and our friendship would remain.

R. Megrabyan: In principle I can say the same thing. It is true, it seems to me, that young people discussed the Karabakh events more keenly and more fervently. Youthfulness was making itself felt.

Correspondent: I met with senior class pupils in Megri and in Ordubadskiy Rayon. Yes, the children's friendship is preserved—and that is the main thing. But I cannot fail to note that in many people the bitterness of perplexity and shame are mingled with friendly feelings. "It was a lesson for people. Everyone saw that we should not succumb to short-term emotions," was how the events around Nagorno-Karabakh were assessed by Megri school Komsomol organizer Suren Gevorkyan. "Now I am trying even harder to come closer to the Armenian people," tenth grader Mushvik Magerramov said. That was how he put it: with the Armenian people and not simply with his Armenian contemporaries. These sincere, heartfelt statements from the children instill optimism in me personally.

R. Megrabyan: In me too. It is gratifying that during the days of the crisis the young people of our rayons displayed restraint and civic responsibility. Understandably this does not remove from the agenda questions of young people's international education. Today, when the most important social problems are being discussed openly, with Bolshevik frankness, we must speak with young people about the difficult lessons of the recent events and the specific practice of internation relations.

Correspondent: I venture to ask the following question. Do disputes about land arise between your rayons? It is no secret that at the moment when inter-nation relations are being aggravated the question "whose land is it?" acquires a special resonance.

Sh. Aleskerov: I remember an Eastern parable which is over 1,000 years old. Two men are arguing almost to the point of fighting about the ownership of the land on which they live. One says: "It's mine!" The other says: "It's mine! This dispute is overheard by a passing wise man. "I will now find out which of you is right," he said, and placed his ear to the ground. "Well, what is the earth telling you?" the quarrellers asked. "It says: You are both mine," the wise man replied.

We have one land. We are all its children. We live in one big family in the Soviet land. What do these territorial disputes give us? Can we not resolve any very complex question in a neighborly, party spirit, in people's interests?

R. Megrabyan: I agree. "We do not live as neighbors but within each other." It is as though Semad Burgun had uttered these words about Megri and Ordubad. Both rayons are in the same, frankly difficult, soil and climatic conditions. There are mountains all around and people cultivate grain literally on stones.

Correspondent: In the mountain settlements of Ordubadskiy Rayon I saw flowering orchards on the slopes. Here too in Megri there are the same artifical plots—"terraces" on whose equipping many years are spent. The 33-year-old lathe operator Isaak Oganesyan showed me his "terrace." The enormous boulders hoisted nearly 100 meters were immediately obvious. I asked Isaak: "How did you drag them here? "By hand," He replied. "My neighbor and I hoisted them up." Oganesyan's neighbor is Abulfaz Allakhkuliyev, an Azerbaijani. Is that not symbolic?

R. Megrabyan: That is our daily life.

Sh. Aleskerov: Yes, in our rayons Armenians, Azerbaijanis, and people of other nationalities work hand in hand. There are still many heavy boulders on our path. It is only by joint, harmonious efforts that we will be able to clear them and renew our land.

Yerevan Radio Interviews Protesters on 'Pogrom'

NC1006141288 Yerevan Domestic Service in Russian 0530 GMT 10 Jun 88

[From the "Echo" radio journal, presented by journalist (Ludmilla Per Petrosyan)]

[Text] Hello, dear friends. The round-the-clock sit-in by young people in the square in front of the Opera House has been going on for more than 2 weeks now. One of

their demands concerns court proceedings against the criminals who perpetrated the pogrom in Sumgait. Here are several interviews conducted by our correspondent Armand Milutyan at the square.

[Begin recording] [Milutyan] Please tell us what you think about events in Sumgait? What happened?

[First unidentified speaker] I am a serviceman from Irkutsk. You know, what I learned after coming here contrasts in many ways with information (?in the press) and what I heard before. [Words indistinct] with many people and heard many opinions from those who arrived from Sumgait and Nagorno-Karabakh, that it had not been a [words indistinct] prank, that it had been organized—and this in our times, in our society, when they talk about the friendship of peoples! We would like on the whole (?to denounce) this, as it runs counter to our rules of life, since we, from time immemorial, from the establishment of Soviet rule—all the peoples in our united family—are friends. But here we have a case where some wanted to cover up this genocide, the disturbances, the humiliation of an entire nation.

[Milutyan] So you are not satisfied with the information supplied by the press?

[Speaker] In effect, events were minimized. In many ways they were minimized by the fact that the press tried to avoid the issue. It tried to minimize the whole matter so as to keep it in the framework of the (?permissible). On the whole, I believe the curtain should be lifted regarding this matter. (?In addition) to what we already know, we should have access to all the facts, because it is time we practiced the glasnost that has been given to the people and which the people will not relinquish.

[Milutyan] What are your wishes regarding the state court that is judging the pogromists in Sumgait?

[Speaker] That this court be an open court. That its proceedings be relayed daily, that there should be a daily record of the proceedings published as a matter of course.

[Milutyan] Now here is Boris Yegoryan, an artist.

[Yegoryan] I would like to say that now our country, the whole of Soviet society, should show the greatest interest in an open, public, show trial to avoid any further very terrible misunderstandings. If the case is not uncovered to its very roots—all the organizers and participants in this dreadful crime—then the people, each of us, and especially myself, will be suspicious. That is why it must be an open, show trial, so that not even one criminal can slip away and so that everyone is informed. Otherwise there will be no solution. [Words indistinct] these official facts, otherwise the consequences will be terrible.

[Khasmik] I am Bayan Khasmik. I work at the Arts and Theater Institute. I assess what happened in Sumgait as vandalism. Most important, we must understand the motive for the crime. This crime should not be viewed as a capital crime but a political one. It was a political act against another nation, and these people should be tried not as individuals, not one-by-one as hooligans, as the trial is now being conducted. The court should try this as a political crime by a group. That is how it must be assessed. Our mass media were very unforthcoming in casting light on these events, but even if we recall what has been said officially, the figures are frightful. This court should be composed of representatives from all the courts of the USSR, from all the republics; this is a must. Otherwise this would be tantamount to getting together by themselves and conducting a trial by themselves. This should not be.

[Second unidentified speaker] First of all, I would like to express my categorical protest against this so-called court. The greatest contradiction in this court is that no consideration is being given to cause or consequences. The consequences were the murders; the cause was the nationality of the victims. If these two things are taken into consideration, it will become self-evident that this crime cannot be separated into individual criminal cases. The events in Sumgait are unprecedented in the history of the Soviet state, which is why the court should have been of an extraordinary nature, not consisting of judges who rely to a certain extent on the Supreme Court of the Azeris and are subordinate to it. The investigation should have been conducted by an independent entity, for example by the USSR Supreme Court. I would also like to add—actually I would like to ask a question—why have none of the relevant (?documents) been published yet?

[Third unidentified speaker] I am a postgraduate student at the [name indistinct] institute. What happened in Sumgait is a disgrace to civilization, to all mankind.

[Milutyan] What strikes one immediately is that people are using hearsay about the brutal crimes in Soviet Sumgait since they do not have access to official sources of information. Furthermore, they do not trust them. Numerous publications have already stated that the scant or incomplete information on events surrounding Nagorno-Karabakh has given rise to complications in an already deteriorating situation. As for Sumgait, the emotional statements by eyewitnesses about the crimes heard by hundreds of thousands were in no way corroborated or denied by the mass media.

The brief official statements about the trials and sentences passed on the criminals raised suspicions that facts have been omitted, while in such an unprecedented case only complete disclosure could have put a stop to rumors. Silence breeds doubt. All those I spoke with referred to the court's lack of justice in dealing with the Sumgait criminals. They can and must be answered. There is no doubt that the scale and, more importantly,

the motive of the crime merit examination by the USSR Supreme Court. Today the question of the court trying the Sumgait criminals is very important for normalizing relations between the Armenian and Azeri peoples. Justice and glasnost in this case can serve not only to eliminate doubt, lack of trust, and fear but also to be a lesson to those who would at any time plot against the rights of the citizens of our country, declared in the Constitution. Glasnost is an ax [words indistinct] wounds, Lenin said. [end recording]

More on Work of Armenian Relocation Commission

NC1006140488 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1730 GMT 9 Jun 88

[Text] As stated in a previous report of 1 June, there were 702 families or 2780 citizens in the republic who have come from Sumgait. These families have been temporarily housed in the republic's various guest houses, as well as with their families and friends. By June 8, the problem of permanent housing for 471 families or 1822 citizens was solved. Some 45 families have expressed their willingness to live in Stepanakert City in Nagorno-Karabakh. Some 46 families are to be permanently housed in the Republic's Baghramyan Oblast. Many families have left for permanent settlement in Leninakan, Kirovakan, Ararat, Sevan, Artashat, Aparan, Spitak and other cities in the republic. Some 85 families are waiting in Masis Oblast and in the cities of Kapan and Jermuk for the documents that will allow them to exchange their private houses in Sumgait with the houses of those who have applied to leave for Azerbaijan SSR.

Activities for the settlement of the citizens who have moved from Sumgait continue in the cities of Aparan, Baghramyan, Akhuryan, Goris and Meghru and in other residential areas. The regional and city soviets are extending all the necessary assistance in order to solve the settlement problems and to accelerate the exchange of houses for the citizens of Sumgait.

Some 118 families have expressed willingness to receive plots of land for the construction of detatched houses in the Abovyan, Nayiri and Ashtarak Oblasts. The necessary plots have been allocated for these houses, and the republic's [word indistinct] institutes have been assigned to (?meet the demands) as soon as possible, and to prepare the necessary documents.

The commission [studying the settlement of citizens who have come from Sumgait] is preparing to submit proposals to all the republic's ministries and offices on the construction of detached houses [words indistinct] by November 2, 1988. Student construction brigades and other (?major) organizations are actively participating in [words indistinct].

The commission studying the problems of the people who have moved from Sumgait continues its work.

Armenians Given Temporary Housing

NC1006140588 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1730 GMT 9 Jun 88

[Text] [Words indistinct] received seven families which arrived from Sumgait (?yesterday) and granted them temporary housing in the professional-technical college's dormitory. These citizens have received all the necessary facilities and are making use of the dormitory's restaurant. The city's public and [words indistinct] are extending every available assistance to them. They are to begin working in the city's offices soon, and their children will be accepted in nurseries and kindergartens. They also are to receive suitable housing in newly established suburbs.

Dam Collapse, Flood Reported in Azerbaijan

LD1206125288 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 11 Jun 88

[Text] In a region of Azerbaijan in the Caucasus, a dam has collapsed in the curve of the Kura River. Several thousand acres of fields have been flooded but there are no human casualties nor damage to the houses. Hundreds of people are combatting the disaster. Building materials are delivered to protect the banks and strengthen the dams. The fields damaged by the flood are being sown anew.

Explosions at Saransk Factory Reported

LD1006140388 Moscow TASS in English 1358 GMT 10 Jun 88

[Text] Saransk June 10 TASS—Dozens of explosions at the start of a day shift today gutted a large warehouse in Saransk, sending property it contained all over the area of the Rezinotekhnika factory in that Volga town.

The blast wave damaged panes in two adjoining workshops. The blaze that started spread to nearby timber piles. Several people sustained burns and injuries. The work of nearby facilities was disrupted for nearly two hours.

Fire brigades swiftly put out the fire and prevented its spread. It was later determined that the warehouse stored saltpetre, sulphur and other inflammable materials.

According to preliminary estimates, the blast occurred as rubbish caught fire from a burning cigarette-butt inside the warehouse, a TASS correspondent learnt from V. Verivskiy, a senior official at the fire-fighting department of the Ministry for the Interior in the Autonomous Republic of Mordovia.

"Details of the accident and the damage it caused will be found out by a special commission," he added.

Democratic Union Member Jailed for 7 Days

AU1006131688 Paris AFP in English 1308 GMT 10 Jun 88

[Excerpt] Moscow, June 10 (AFP)—Valeria Novodvorskaya, a member of the Soviet Democratic Union, the first independent opposition party since the Stalinist era, was arrested at her Moscow home Friday and sentenced to seven days' imprisonment, a dissident source said here.

Democratic Union spokesman Yuri Mitiunov said Mrs Novodvorskaia was sent to jail for not obeying police instructions during a demonstration on April 15.

The spokesman said he was worried about her health as she had recently staged several hunger strikes following earlier condemnations for illegal demonstrations.

Most recently she was sentenced to 15 days in jail for a lone protest on May 12 in Moscow's Red Square during which she sought to explain to passers by the reasons for the setting up of the Democratic Union. [passage omitted]

Police Chief Views 'Informal' Group Protests

LD1006154488 Moscow World Service in English 1500 GMT 10 Jun 88

[Text] Over the past half month Moscow has seen about 40 meetings and demonstrations of various informal groups; they involved more than 2,000 people, and that was reported by the Moscow police chief, Petr Bogdanov.

He told the Moscow PRAVDA the legal bodies saw their task in providing order during such gatherings. He said some extremist members of informal groups had deliberately bullied policemen, provoking them to respond. However, the legal bodies had firm instructions to act according to the Soviet Constitution, which guarantees the rights of the citizens.

Yaroslavl Rally Airs Citizens' Grievances

PM1006163788 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondent M. Ovcharov report under the rubric "Learning Democracy": "The Rally in Yaroslavl"]

[Text] Nothing like this had ever happened in Yaroslavl. Until quite recently no one even imagined that anything like this was possible. On Wednesday, 8 June, a huge crowd of some 5,000 people gathered toward the end of the day on the Volga embankment near the Nekrasov monument. It was not a spontaneous gathering. Shortly beforehand leaflets signed "Action Group" appeared on the walls of houses, at bus and trolleybus stops, and on lamp posts. They contained an appeal to the inhabitants of Yaroslavl to attend a rally on the embankment in support of restructuring. Surprising as it may be, an unknown group, reportedly consisting of 30 young people, was able to stir the city and gather a large audience.

Incidentally, the mystery surrounding the group did not last long. Two days before the set date the group submitted to the gorispolkom an official notification specifying the place and time of the rally and its aims. After that, businesslike meetings were held between Yaroslavl party and soviet leaders and members of the "Action Group." As a result many practical questions were resolved and—very important—the group obtained the official sanction of the gorispolkom to hold the rally.

And so came 8 June, 1600 hours. In the streets and squares adjoining the embankment the white summer shirts of the militia workers could be glimpsed. It was the "Action Group" which had requested that the militia ensure order during the rally. The crowd of calm and collected people of various ages heading toward the Volga was getting bigger and bigger.

At the Nekrasov monument, long before the rally started, you could hear applause and the whir of cinecameras. Eye-catching, handwritten posters were fluttering in the air: "Restructuring! Glasnost! Democracy!"; "The People and the Party Are United! We Call on the Obkom To Prove It in Action!"; "Only Worthy, Honest, and Courageous Comrades for the Party Conference!"; "Comrade Obkom! We Want To Know the Whole Truth About the Elections of Delegates to the Party Conference!"

The word "party conference" featured on many of the posters. This was no accident, of course, since the pretext for organizing the rally was the results of the elections of delegates to the 19th party conference at the Yaroslavl CPSU Obkom plenum. Or to be more precise, the election as conference delegate of F.I. Loshchenkov, former first secretary of the CPSU Obkom, in a situation which—in the opinion of the rally's participants—lacked glasnost since it was carried out without the consultation of primary party organizations and labor collectives; of the same Loshchenkov who had contributed "his part" to stagnation (as described in the letter of Yaroslavl librarian A. Malygina published in PRAVDA 2 June).

It was this issue which brought passions to the boil straight away (as soon as the rally opened and the militia lent the speakers their bullhorn). There were many critical and cogent, if sometimes overemotional, speeches from workers, scientists, writers, and engineers. True, at times the shouts and noise made it difficult to proceed.

The rally was attended by obkom, gorkom, oblispolkom, and gorispolkom leaders. And they did not just attend, they did make use of the microphone. The officials failed to persuade those present that they were right, either

because of the lack of their skill in addressing a crowd or because of an absence of arguments. But they did argue and express their viewpoints which, you will agree, is better than silence.

You could sense that the members of the "Action Group" were waiting especially impatiently for the speeches of two delegates to the 19th party conference which had been promised by the CPSU Obkom. Was this perhaps because they did not trust them, because they believed that all the delegates could do was to toe the obkom's line?

The first delegate—V. Kozmenkov, engine plant fitter and installation worker—took the microphone. By that time someone had managed to rig up a public address system. To begin with no one was really listening to Kozmenkov. There was booing and whistling. Raising his voice above the noise, he said: "I understand that my election as candidate is an expression of great trust on the part of the city's inhabitants which has yet to be justified. I do not hide the fact that the elections left me with a burdensome legacy: The whole campaign took place in accordance with the rules of the old times of stagnation and in violation of the principles of glasnost and democracy." These words of the delegate met with the applause of those present.

Then another delegate to the 19th party conference—teacher G. Lyadova—took the microphone: "I will define my civic and party stance here before you today. I will say the main thing...." (The noise immediately died down.) "And the main thing is that I wholly and entirely back your demands, comrades!" The response was a salvo of applause.

The stream of speeches at the rally seemed unending. People were not just talking about party conference electoral procedure but also about poor supplies in the city, about the acute shortage of hospitals and housing, and about violations of the principles of social justice. Many personal grievances were also aired. The heap of requests for permission to speak got higher and higher. The time allocated by the gorispolkom for the rally was running out. After an appeal by members of the "Action Group" to those present to comply with the regulations and after noisy squabbling, Militia Major General A. Toporov, chief of the oblispolkom Internal Affairs Department, took the microphone. "Comrades," he said, "you know that we are here to ensure public order. You have just demonstrated your civic maturity in your speeches in support of restructuring. I would like to ask you to demonstrate it again by dispersing calmly and in an organized fashion."

After that people began to leave in an orderly manner. True, many—more than 2,000 of them, I was told—signed a collective letter before they left about violations of glasnost during the elections in Yaroslavl of delegates to the 19th party conference. This, incidentally, was officially acknowledged also in a resolution adopted at a meeting of the city's party-economic aktiv 6 June. It was decided that the collective letter of the rally participants should be sent to the Credentials Commission of the 19th party conference. And so the first "mass," "informal" rally has been held in Yaroslavl, and despite misgivings it passed without any kind of excesses, in an entirely normal fashion. It was announced at the rally that a meeting is to be held in Yaroslavl within the next few days of all people who would like to establish a united front of activists of restructuring.

Georgian Plenum Proceedings Criticized

PM1006143088 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 9 Jun 88 p 2

[Report by special correspondents Ia. Mukhraneli and An. Kamenev: "Unanimity? Notes From the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] Tbilisi—Nearly two-thirds of university entrants receive "fails" in the entrance examinations, while only 40 percent of medal winners graduating from Georgian schools pass the tests. The republic's enterprises and various departments and institutions literally reject economists and lawyers graduating from Tbilisi and Sukhumi Universities, teachers with diplomas from the Batumi and South Ossetian Institutes, transport workers and metallurgists from the Georgian Polytechnic.... You will agree that here are grounds for very serious thought and radical solutions.

And that, indeed, is what we thought on listening to the report of D. Patiashvili, first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, which not only indicated the tricky points in this problem that is very acute for the republic (and, indeed, for the whole country), but also defined ways of resolving it, ways of restructuring the republic's education system. Let us add—in conjunction, as is essential today, with the restructuring in all spheres of our life.

The report urged an open, honest discussion and called for intense debates: The Central Committee was not imposing its own solution to the problem, but proposing a joint quest for a solution. There was indeed plenty to talk and argue about, and there was scope for a clash of opinions.

Today, living in the 4th year of the restructuring calendar, we really should all have learned to conduct concrete, businesslike discussions, resisting eulogies and managing without the once compulsory assurances....

Alas, even today we heard more than enough of all this at the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee plenum, where three very important matters were on the agenda: tasks in restructing higher and secondary education, elections of delegates to the 19th all-union party conference, and organizational questions that had accumulated.

Whether because of the seriousness of the questions submitted or for other reasons, the plenum was postponed several times. An animated debate on problems of education was conducted in the local press. A wide response was aroused by a letter from Academician Arnold Chikobava, which was written back in 1972, but has lost none of its relevance and was only recently published; the letter is about the serious malaise affecting education, about indifference and formalism, about the ineffectiveness of the chain "school—VUZ—production," about the devaluation of knowledge and the absoluete need for a return to the fundamental study of certain subjects by students.... In the last 16 years the situation in schools and VUZ's has remained virtually unchanged. It should have begun to change. It did not.

The plenum, while offering its platform to scientists and workers, and to party, soviet, Komsomol, and even sports leaders, left out those who work directly with children—the teachers. They were not given the floor. The enormous group of problems that face the newly created Ministry of Public Education, which has to build an integrated education system in the republic, was also bypassed in silence.

Literally on the eve of the plenum, it was decided to start with the elections of delegates to the 19th party conference and the organizational questions. We think that is correct—a month before the conference, no problem is more important.

More than 400 candidacies were examined in the primary party organizations. Perhaps there could have been even more. For every delegate's mandate, 4-5 candidates were put forward and 126 candidacies were submitted for consideration by the Central Committee bureau, which had to choose and recommend to the plenum only 93. Another five mandates were handed over to the army Communists, and eight to the central list. Let us not analyze here the various omissions and defects in the election campaign that took place—much has already been written about them, and all that remains for us to do is to learn the lessons.

It must be admitted that a rather ambivalent impression was made by this whole procedure and the way it was carried out in the republican party organization. On the one hand, the right to choose was apparently observed and the candidacies were discussed in the primary organizations. True, the list was published in the republican press only a week beforehand. The Central Committee bureau, as B. Nikolskiy, second secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, told us, received some 2,000 letters containing proposals and expressing approval or doubts. The day before the plenum the newspaper ZARYA VOSTOKA published an editorial article "It Is Not Too Late To Make Amendments"—thoughts on the candidacies for conference delegates, raising certain questions in a rather searching and principled way. On the final list submitted to the plenum, three candidacies were replaced. Apparently everything was in order. But on the other hand, it smacked rather of something planned in advance. The principle that still prevailed here, albeit not openly, was the notorious principle of allocations [raznaryadka]—the desire to ensure that the body of delegates includes representatives of all leading sectors of the economy and that all the rayons and autonomous republics are represented equally. But even this can be approached in different ways. After all, people are not going to a rally of production frontrunners or a conference of leaders, but to a real, epoch-making party conference, a conference in the course of which topical and urgent problems of the theory and practice of revolutionary restructuring will be discussed. And here we need not simply "ardent supporters of restructuring," but political fighters who understand various aspects of the complex process of transformations.

We realize that the list was submitted for discussion, and that is something. But those three candidacies were replaced in he course of the discussion on the basis of...the representative principle: Why have two people, it was said, from one plant, when there is no doctor or trade worker on the list.... And in fact it is rather difficult to say how the candidacies were discussed at the plenum itself, because the panegyrics that were heard were far removed from truly businesslike discussion—from "has awards and certificates" and "representative of the working class" to "a good family man" and "mother of five." What if someone has no awards and represents young creative people? What if someone has no family, or if there are only two children in the family?...

But the unanimity was total. There was literally a waiting line for the microphones that were installed in the auditorium—about 30 people hurried to give "references" for their candidates. And not one of them asked the question: What are you taking to the conference? Is the value of such unanimity really so high?

For some reason, not one of the participants in the plenum asked himself: What kind of a post is "former chairman," and why will the republican party organization be represented at the conference by A. Dumachev, former chairman—that is how he was introduced to the plenum—of the USSR State Committee for Vocational and Technical Education, which, moreover, has now been disbanded?

And the complacency was obvious during the discussion of the last item (the second, on the protocol)—the cadre question. The chairman recited the names and posts and those present raised their hands. Everything was as it always was. And apparently, as always, nobody wondered why, for instance, the fact that F. Sanakoyev, former first secretary of the South Osetian party obkom, was released from his duties as candidate member of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau, was explained in terms of his transfer to other work. Yet everyone, not only in the republic, knows that it was this leader's inactivity that led to a critical situation in

Tskhinvali, capital of South Osetia, in spring of this year, and he was relieved of his post at the request of the inhabitants of the autonomous republic.

Without too many questions, people also voted in the usual way for the release of G. Yenukidze from his duties as Central Committee secretary—in connection with his appointment as republican minister of public education.

Questions, questions, questions... Unfortunately, they were not asked at the plenum. The participants voted with the customary unanimity for all the candidate delegates to the party conference, for all the official appointments, and for the proposed resolution. Only on one issue did applause that was by no means indifferent suddenly break out in the auditorium.

We have already spoken of the brilliant capacities for using a lofty platform to clarify attitudes. Certain speakers could not resist this opportunity at the plenum and, patently whipping up unhealthy passions, attacked certain central newspapers that "dared" to criticize certain negative facts and phenomena in the republic. This was perceived as an attempt supposedly to discredit the entire Georgian people. This sensitive reaction to criticism hampers the examination of the real problem and the objective study of the crux of the matter.

We have tried to write these notes as objectively as possible, and we hope that people in the republic will respond to them equally objectively.

Delegate Interviewed on Upcoming Conference

LD0306195688 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 3 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] (Aleksandr Mikhaylovich Teshukov), a worker at the Leningrad Kirovskiy Zavod association, and delegate to the forthcoming party conference, shares his ideas on the conference:

[(Teshukov)] I would like to point out that the measures mapped out in the theses relating to democratization of party life will, if we implement them all, perceptibly enhance the role of the party in our society. [passage omitted]

I consider it absolutely necessary to carry out certification, certification of every Communist, examining his specific contribution to the affairs of his party organization and the affairs of life in our country; and perhaps even to get rid of those who are mere ballast today. We do not need them in the party. [passage omitted]

I would suggest that in the period between congresses the apparatus—well, not the apparatus, but the Central Committee—should be renewed. This is mentioned in the Theses. Perhaps one could go even further and expand the Central Committee today, with an inflow of workers; one could increase the complement of the Central Committee, that will also improve the link between the masses and the party, that would have a positive effect, too. I think that should most definitely be envisaged and discussed at the conference.

Grodno Obkom Chief Kletskov Interviewed

WA18000354 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 20 14-20 May 88 pp 1-2

[Interview with Leonid Gerasimovich Kletskov, first secretary of the Grodno Obkom of the Belorussian Communist Party and Hero of Socialist Labor, by correspondent V. Voronetskiy: "Democracy as I Understand It"; date and place not given]

[Text] Correspondent: Leonid Gerasimovich, vigorous preparations are being made in the country for the 19th all-union party conference. As is well-known, it will analyze progress in carrying out the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress, will sum up the results of the first year of the 5-year planning period, and will take up the problems of further democratization of the life of the party and society. What proposals and thoughts do you personally have in this connection?

Kletskov: Quite a few of them have gathered. I agree with many authors of letters now being published in the press. We, of course, need to improve both the practice of enrollment in the party and the work of the elective party aktiv, as well as the range of duties of the staff of official party bodies. In my view, if the party's authority and influence is to be increased, it has to be freed of members who are not really Communists: degenerates who are indifferent to public affairs and bureaucrats who have become detached from the people. Every party member should be examined individually, especially with respect to what he has done and how he has behaved in recent decades.

I feel that the staffs of raykoms, gorkoms, and obkoms are greatly inflated and in this regard do not meet the requirements of restructuring and economic methods of management. Our oblast committee, for example, is by no means the largest, but even it could be reduced. Instead of branch and sector departments, a single strong economic department should be created.

The number of inhabitants and the number of party members should be taken into account in creating official party bodies at the local level. More thought should be given to the advisability of raykoms and gorkoms in rayons and cities with population under 50,000 and when there are less than 3,000 party members.

I am also disturbed by the question of the need to revive the power of the soviets in the sense that Lenin meant it. The prolonged rule of the system in which all matters were decided by the staff has had the result that the soviet has become a kind of official body which actually

decides nothing. A situation has come about in which it is not the ispolkom which is an appendage of the soviet, but the soviet which is an appendage of the ispolkom.

The question of questions is delineating the functions of party entities from those of the state. I feel that party leadership must be exercised not by command, but by influence, through cadres of party members and party groups in soviets. Such groups exist even now, but they are conductors for passing on party influence only in a formal sense. What usually happens is that an hour before the session begins we approve the operating procedure and agenda presented by the ispolkom, and that is all.

The question of the work of the soviets is a complicated one, but it has to be dealt with. The process now taking place in the country of a reduction of the staff for management of economic and sociocultural development should be borne in mind in this connection. For example, we have worked out a new scheme for that kind of management. It calls for reducing the staff subordinate to the oblispolkom by 29 percent.

I think the time has come to reduce the staff of the agroprom as well. It now consists of 200 persons in the oblast, although it could get along with half that. It is not pursuers and guides that we need, but experienced consultants and advisers.

I assume that there will be serious discussion in the conference about how bureaucracy is to be conquered and a barrier set up to income not derived from work.

Correspondent: How do you, a man who has been hardened by action at the front, perceive the process taking place in the country of democratization and glasnost?

Kletskov: I vote for it with both hands, but provided that democracy and discipline are two sides of the same coin and are closely and inseparably related to one another. Discuss, study public opinion, take it into account in making a decision, but once it has been made, carry it out vigorously and with initiative, applying every effort. Otherwise, nothing will come of it. We still have many people who only like to talk.

There has in fact been progress in the development of democracy. About 1,000 leaders in the party, the soviet, and the economy have been elected in the oblast by the method of glasnost, in competition. But an analysis of letters and oral communications received by the obkom, meetings of bureau members with work collectives, and a study of the progress of restructuring at the local level show that by no means all party, soviet, and economic leaders have learned how to work under the new conditions. In developing democracy, we need to be bolder in advancing to positions of leadership young specialists who are not in the party, and at the same time take the ethnic composition of the oblast's population into account more fully. We need to be more decisive in entrusting positions of responsibility to women. At present, there are 130 of them in positions of leadership in party and soviet bodies.

So long as we are discussing the shortcomings of leaders, many of them are not tactful or good-tempered, they do not respect or recognize the right to one's own opinion, nor do they analyze mistakes honestly, competently, and frankly.

Aside from knowledge and competence, I, for example, esteem in a leader a devotion to principle and a feeling of responsibility for the task he has been given. Restructuring and the new methods of economic activity presuppose independence on the part of specialists and the managers of economic entities. This independence must exist in reality, not just on paper. We have indeed "swaddled" people in commands—hut, two, three, four! Hut, two, three, four! Now it will not work that way. Everyone must be interested in his job and take responsibility for it. Conceit and arrogance are fatal for a leader, not to mention venality.

Correspondent: The latter is unfortunately rather widespread. Many of our readers tell about the privileges which those in power at the local level create for themselves. They make purchases in special stores, you will not see them riding public transportation, they don't go into the shop for love nor money, and they build dachas they cannot afford.

Kletskov: We are making an effort so they will not have that to write and say about us. For example, I have made it a rule to take 10,000 steps (or 5-6 km) every day. You do not do that in an office. We do not have special stores for leaders. Party and soviet officials in our oblast do not have state dachas either. I do not even have one, although, of course, I could have.

Correspondent: Some of our readers complain that obkom first secretaries are not accessible. How often do you personally receive visitors, and on what matters? After all, the first secretary cannot, say, deal personally with a housing matter which is a prerogative of a people's court.

Kletskov: We receive visitors every day. A schedule is drawn up stating when the various obkom secretaries, their assistants, and heads of departments receive visitors. My day is the first Monday of every month. On that day I manage to see 30-35 people. The subject matter of the conversations is highly diverse. If I am unable to settle the question myself, I ask that it be looked into by the heads of the competent authorities, and I tell the visitor about this. My office is also open to people on other days. Just now I have finished a conversation with two visitors from the rayons, although it is not actually

the day when my office is open to the public. My office telephone number is well-known in the city. People call quite often, bypassing the secretary in the reception room.

Correspondent: And they do not hinder you?

Kletskov: No, I have become convinced that people do not get disturbed for trifles. I receive calls from two or three persons a day, always in the daytime. The conversations are also useful to me. Any alienation from people is intolerable for a party official and for a leader in general. It is only work with people and for people that justifies all our efforts at restructuring and can result in success.

Correspondent: Leonid Gerasimovich, you might be called the dean [aksakal] among leaders of oblast party organizations. Please tell us briefly about yourself.

Kletskov: Thank you for the compliment, although being the elder is not the most welcome thing in life. I would like to have my 20 or 30 years back! But my biography, like many of my contemporaries, is filled with both happy and distressing events. I was born in a village near ancient Polotsk in a peasant family. As an adolescent I learned how to plow. At the age of 17 I attended the reading hut in the village. I worked as a secretary and chairman of the village council and secretary of the Komsomol raykom. I put on a soldier's blouse on the second day of the Great Patriotic War. I was discharged only in 1947. I held various positions in Komsomol and in soviet and party bodies. I have been first secretary of the Grodno party obkom since 1972.

Correspondent: You worked in positions of leadership under Stalin, under Khrushchev, and also under Brezhnev. You have your opinion about each of them, and you can make comparisons....

Kletskov: I fully concur in the assessment made of these political figures in the speech of M.S. Gorbachev commemorating the 70th anniversary of Great October. It was judicious and objective. It was with Stalin's name on our lips that we went to fight the enemy. That is how we were brought up. That was the time of his cult. Then when people learned about the large-scale repressions, about his role in the illegality, there came a sobering up. Many people were looked upon differently. But exposure of Stalin's personality cult was not taken all the way. Khrushchev only initiated that process, and he deserves a great deal of credit for doing so. It took boldness and civic courage to undertake such a thing. Unfortunately, after that everything was dropped. With the help of bootlickers Brezhnev conceived himself to be a genius, and with his excessive desire for glory he inflicted quite a bit of harm to the prestige of the party leader.

Correspondent: And how in this connection do you evaluate the recent PRAVDA editorial about the processes of restructuring and the revolutionary character of thought and action?

Kletskov: I approve and support the principle and conclusions contained in it. There is no need to fear that in developing democracy, in expanding glasnost, in removing all kinds of prohibitions and restrictions, that we are shaking the pillars of socialism. Can the "salvation" of socialism lie in preserving authoritarian edicts, the practice of thoughtlessly doing what you are told and suppression of initiative? Can it lie in preserving a system in which bureaucracy, arbitrariness, corruption, extortion, and petit bourgeois degeneration are in full flower? No, and no once again.

Socialism's salvation lies in a return to Leninist principles of democracy, social justice, cost accounting, and respect for the honor, life, and dignity of the human individual. In the face of the people's difficulties, which have not been invented, and the needs which have not been satisfied, we have no right to adhere to those approaches which took shape in the thirties and forties and which are now holding back our forward advance to an appreciable extent.

Correspondent: Grodno is building up rapidly. There are many new residential buildings, and all the apartments are well-equipped in every one. Have you moved?

Kletskov: I have lived in the same apartment during all the years I have worked in Grodno.

Correspondent: What family do you have?

Kletskov: I live with my wife. She is the principal of a secondary school. The children are grown, they live apart, not in Grodno.

Correspondent: And your income?

Kletskov: My income is 550 rubles. Incidentally, it is not the highest in the oblast, as some people think. The chairman of our economically strong kolkhozes receive 600-800 rubles a month on the average. The wages of herdsmen and machine operators go as high as 400-500 rubles, and those working on contract earn even more. For example, kolkhoz member K. Maleshko from our progressive Berestovitskiy Rayon, who raises little pigs, earned an average of 700 rubles a month last year.

Correspondent: The mail we receive contains quite a few pessimistic letters about the progress of restructuring. How is it going in your oblast?

Kletskov: There has been improvement, although not everything is going smoothly everywhere. The oblast successfully fulfilled the targets of the last 5-year planning period and has gotten a good start in this one. Industry completed the assignment of the first 2 years of

the 5-year period for the growth rates of commodity output and labor productivity ahead of schedule. Plans were substantially overfulfilled for the output of products in the superior-quality category and consumer goods. The workers of the agro-industrial complex made us happy. The yield of grain crops in 1987 exceeded 40 quintals, that of potatoes 233, and sugar beets 345 quintals. Average milk production per dairy cow was 3,216 kg for the year. For every 100 hectares of farmland in the oblast more than 700 quintals of milk was produced and more than 211 quintals of meat (live weight) was sold. Over the last 3 years housing construction has increased 19 percent, the output of consumer goods has risen 10 percent in the last 2 years. There has also been progress in the food supply to the public. Sales of meats and sausages in the oblast have grown 25 percent in the last 2 years, sales of butter 19 percent, and vegetable sales 21 percent.

We are expanding the network of cooperatives. We have 164 of them. More than 1,800 persons in the oblast are self-employed.

Correspondent: The role of the oblast party organization is beyond question in the changes taking place. What is there new in the style and methods of its work?

Kletskov: There have been many changes. I would emphasize the main thing: we have been striving to create in every party organization an atmosphere of exactingness and comradely mutual assistance and to see that every party member sets a personal example. We have even had to resort to penalties. In 3 years about 2,000 persons have been expelled from the ranks of the party for various violations of party discipline. More than 3,800 party members have received various punishments.

Correspondent: What is your mood? How do you think things will go this year?

Kletskov: My mood is sanguine and optimistic, as is that of all the workers in the oblast. Our thoughts and aspirations are bent on going beyond what we have achieved.

Reader on Points Arising From Theses

PM0306154988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jun 88 Second Edition p 2

[Letter from L. Lelchuk, member of the CPSU since 1960, under the rubric "More Democracy": "No Provisos"]

[Text] Even people who are far removed from our ideals may, after perusing the Central Committee Theses, have a clear picture of how, figuratively speaking, the Soviet citizen has straightened his shoulders and taken a deep breath.

What I would like to talk about is this:

In my opinion, the main reason for the appearance and subsequent repeated revival of the personality cult in our country lies in the absence of any critical analysis of the activity of top party leaders. Since the end of the twenties, since the death of V.I. Lenin, it has become established practice that everything coming from top organs of leadership is automatically approved and strictly carried out. This is the source of our hypertrophied centralism. What is more, it seems that this practice is still largely maintained today, despite the appeals to eliminate "zones exempt from criticism." I regard this as the biggest danger for the future.

Of course, there are a considerable number of brave, single-minded people among the new leaders. They have taken an enormous responsibility upon themselves. They have our respect and gratitude for this. But a person is only human, whatever post he may hold. He can make mistakes and not see his own errors.

Or take the policy directed against high-handed, administrative methods of management. But surely the measures to combat drunkenness and alcoholism are arbitrary and administrative in the main? This approach has already greatly harmed people and the national economy. If we do not stop and rectify our mistakes, this damage will be even more considerable.

The Central Committee Theses outline a series of provisions designed to further democratize internal party life. They propose in particular to limit the term of office in elected party work. There can be no question that this is a good measure. But in my opinion, it still does not guarantee success. I would like to remind you that a similar proposal was made in N.S. Khrushchev's time. However, then as now, provisos were made which allowed exceptions which subsequently became the rule. Consequently, I believe that we should amplify the current procedure governing the election of first secretaries of party committees.

What do I specifically have in mind? To make regular partywide referendums on the attitude toward top party leaders standard practice. I imagine this would proceed roughly as follows. During report and election campaigns in primary party organizations, every Communist would not only elect by secret ballot the staff of the party bureau and the party secretary but also fill in a ballot paper giving a "yes" or "no" evaluation of the performance by top party leaders of various ranks. Communists' opinions would be summed up. Any top leader receiving more than 50 percent "no" votes would automatically lose the right to retain his position. [Signed] L. Lelchuk, member of the CPSU since 1960

Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy

Zaslavskaya Views Social Changes, Elections

LD0406101388 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 3 Jun 88

[Text] A news conference was given today in the Soviet-U.S. summit press center in Moscow by Academician Tatyana Ivanovna Zaslavskaya, president of the Soviet

Sociological Association and director of the All-Union Public Opinion Research Center on Social and Economic Questions attached to the AUCCTU and the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems. Responding to a question on the changes which have taken place in recent years in the life of our society, she said in particular:

[Begin recording] [Zaslavskaya] The Russian people, in particular, have always been notable for their extraordinary attention to spiritual values and to the spiritual aspect of development. In this respect, the living conditions of the whole population have changed for the better on a colossal scale. Instead of being guarded and wary in conversation, people have now opened up. They sense their right to be assertive. They are straightening...I can't say that they have completely straightened up. This probably requires some time. But this process is taking place before our eyes, and, in this respect, we are already able to say that there is no return to the old road. Really radical changes have taken place. This must without fail be consolidated, consolidated in economic terms as quickly as possible.

[Unidentified journalist] How do you assess the experience of the meetings for electing delegates to the 19th party conference?

[Zaslavskaya] I think that very probably the procedure for putting forward candidates for the 19th conference was not sufficiently well thought out. But, in general, in such a new matter, (?in general), conferences have not been convened, as people here have been saying, for 1,000 years, and in such a new matter as restructuring, mistakes and incomplete work are, in essence, unavoidable. For example, the fact that such a ferment has arisen in a whole number of regions of the country indicates, of course, that there was much that hadn't been thought out here. But the very fact of the increased activity is an extraordinarily important aspect, in my view. For example, the reaction of the population to this, and of the Communists in the first instance, is absolutely uncommon and unfettered and with a knowledge of their rights.

Thus, in Moscow there were demonstrations by students protesting at the fact that Yuriy Afanasyev, the rector of the Moscow Historical Archives Institute and one of the more prominent, as it were, figures in restructuring, was not elected. But this is a new phenomenon for us. A whole range of party organizations disagree with the decisions of the raykoms. In general, there is a great deal of activity connected with this fact. In this way, they are already becoming not passive observers of restructuring but active participants in restructuring, campaigners for it.

[Journalist] This relates to the Theses of the party conference—have you read them, and what is your view?

[Zaslavskaya] Good. The emphasis which has been amde on the political aspect seems to me to be correct becasue it has already become quite clear enough that the progress of the radical economic reform is being slowed down today in the first instance by backwardness in the political system. So long as the diktat of party bodies in the economic sphere remain essentially unchanged, the consistent implementation of the ideas of the radical economic reform— development of commodity and monetary relations, of material incentives, the role of profit, material interest and so on—will be impossible, because this is noneconomic compulsion. And an end has to be put to this. This idea, it seems to me, has been represented vigorously enough in the Theses in the shape of a new concept, in essence, of the structure of political power, a clear seapration of the functions of the party as the political, ideological leader of society, and the system of the normal administration of state, of soviet-based power. [end recording]

Russian Orthodox Church Assembly Ends

LD0806231288 Moscow TASS in English 1754 GMT 8 Jun 88

[Text] Zagorsk June 8 TASS—The session of the three-day assembly of the Russian Orthodox Church marking the millenium of the baptism of Russ closed in the Trinity-St Segius Lavra in Zagorsk, outside Moscow, today.

It has been learnt from quarters close to the council of 70 bishops that today the conference considered the activity of educational establishments of the Russian Orthodox Church and the economic department of the Moscow patriarchate.

The draft of the administrative charter for the church was discussed in elaborate detail. The local orthodox churches are known to have their charters. Their goal is to help apply ancient canonical precepts in conditions of the present-day life. Until today, the Russian Orthodox Church was administered on the basis of the provison which was adopted at one time in historical conditions which appeared not to favourable enough for church life and hampered to adopt a charter.

Many archpriests, figures of the diocesan departments and laymen took part in the discussion of this important document, that fully reflects various aspects of the church administration. In the form in which the charter was endorsed at the grand assembly today it is congruent with the civil law and can be enacted normally in Soviet territory.

Statement Urges Peace

LD1006104388 Moscow TASS in English 1758 GMT 9 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 9 TASS—"Peace, not war, is a natural state of humankind. Achieving and preserving peace is a noble task of all people of goodwill," says the

statement of the local council (general assembly) of the Russian Orthodox Church, which came to a close today in the Trinity-St. Sergius Lavra (Monastery) in Zagorsk, near Moscow.

The council, convened to mark the 1,000th anniversary of Christianity in Russia, discussed topical tasks of the church's public service. It adopted the statement on burning issues, such as the real threat of nuclear catastrophe, regional conflicts and local wars, ecological problems.

The statement pointed out that today, "as never before, it is necessary to involve religious peace-makers in the endeavour to guard the most sacred gift of life."

It expressed profound satisfaction with the fact that the Soviet-American treaty on the elimination of two classes of nuclear missiles became a first step along that path.

"We believe it is vitally necessary to build on that achievement by concluding an agreement between the USSR and the United States on reducing by 50 per cent their strategic offensive arms.

The outcome of the Moscow summit between General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan gives grounds for the realisation of that project in the near future. This, we believe, will impart an irreversible character to the process of nuclear disarmament and will be a major step towards ridding the earth of nuclear weapons."

The council, which had earlier sent a message to the third special session of the U.N. General Assembly on disarmament, expressed the hope that everything would be done at the session "to rid our civilisation of the fetters of nuclear hostages."

Concerned over the plans to use space for military purposes, the council came out in favour of "the adoption of a corresponding international treaty that would give a fresh impetus to its peaceful exploration."

The statement expressed alarm over continuing regional conflicts. "Together with broad religious and public circles around the world, we express support for our oppressed and fighting brothers and sisters in southern Africa and declare that the racist system of apartheid contradicts the Christian tradition."

On the situation in the Middle East, the authors of the statement shared "the profound concern of many churches and religious associations around the world and also their hope for the earliest convocation of an authoritative international conference on the Middle East with the participation of all sides concerned."

Noting with "profound sorrow" the drama of the continued fratricidal war between Iran and Iraq, they expressed support for "any efforts directed at establishing peace in that volatile region."

The Council expressed compassion with the struggle for democracy and human rights in Latin America and the Caribbean.

"While rejoicing at the agreement on the political settlement of Afghanistan's problems and hoping for their successful translation into life, we express our anxiety and profound concern over the fate of our compatriots that went missing or are in captivity," the statement said.

The church workers called "upon all who are able to facilitate the positive solution of that issue to make everything in their power."

The local council of the Russian Orthodox Church came out for the "harmonious and wise combination of the effort to improve material well-being and foster moral perfection of the individual and society in the name of the conscious utilisation of natural resources and the preservation of the globe for the succeeding generations."

The statement expressed the confidence that the celebration of the 1,000th anniversary of the Russian Orthodox Church would give a fresh impetus to the "peace-making service jointly with all people of goodwill."

Justice Minister Addresses Supreme Soviet

PM0506174388 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 May 88 Morning Edition p 4

["Speech by Deputy B.V. Kravtsov of Shyaulyayskiy Rural Electoral Okrug (Lithuanian SSR)" (USSR Minister of Justice) at 26 May 1988 Morning Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities in the Great Kremlin Palace, Moscow]

[Text] Summing up the initial results of our work under the conditions of restructuring, I must say that we have not yet succeeded in completely overcoming old approaches in courts' activity. Cases where pressure is brought applied on judges and attempts made to interfere in legal activity by local party and soviet bodies have not all been eradicated. There have been cases where "intractable" judges have not been recommended for election.

The report and co-report rightly place the emphasis on improving the standard of justice in the broadest sense of this word. Here a great deal depends on the USSR Ministry of Justice and bodies under its jurisdiction. But in this respect I cannot fail to mention the conditions under which judges work and which undoubtedly have an effect on the quality of justice. Almost half of all courts are housed in premises that do not meet the

requirements for the administration of justice. If you consider the pace at which this problem is being solved, it could take many years yet.

As was noted at the May CPSU Central Committee Plenum, an important place in work to complete the formation of a socialist legal state is held by compulsory legal education for the population and work to improve and codify existing legislation, as well as efforts to enhance the role and authority of justice. The Ministry of Justice is aware of the degree of its responsibility in this task. Work still has to be done both at the center and at the local level in connection with bringing all legal norms into line with the new economic management conditions, new legal acts, and, in particular, the Law on Cooperatives. This is very important but only represents one aspect of the task. A great deal has to be done to properly organize the legal service in the national economy and to ensure proper execution of the laws on the state enterprise, cooperatives, and individual labor activity.

I would like to say a few words, comrades, about the proposal made by Deputy V.S. Shevchenko: to combine the functions of organizational leadership of the courts and legal activity in one body—the court of law. This kind of experiment was conducted for 15 years, when the higher courts, particularly the Supreme Courts of the union and autonomous republics, and also oblast and kray courts, were invested with administrative functions they did not normally have.

They were responsible for selecting cadres, carrying out checks, deciding economic issues, and examining cases. The lower courts were dependent on the higher courts, which resulted in a mad scramble to secure formal indicators and a steady flow of verdicts and decisions to the detriment of the rule of law. This procedure had to be rectified and changed. It should be said that this problem has been discussed many times by judges and legal workers. There are different views on the matter but nevertheless the majority of legal experts are opposed to this proposal.

Comrade deputies! The USSR Supreme Soviet session's discussion of the report by the country's highest legal body will undoubtedly give new impetus to the task of improving the activity of courts throughout the country, the USSR Ministry of Justice, and the bodies under its jurisdiction with the aim of successfully solving the tasks at the present stage of the restructuring process. (Applause)

Scholar Urges Reform in Legal Sphere

PM0706123588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 4

[Article by Academician V. Kudryavtsev under the "19th Party Conference: The Tasks of Restructuring" rubric: "Democratization and Legal Reform"—boldface as published]

[Text] Every stage of restructuring demands solid underpinning not only by political decisions and cadre reorganization but also by legal means.

The CPSU Central Committee Theses not only name those means but also propose a far broader task: The task of creating a permanent mechanism for democratic development and completing the formation of a socialist legal state.

The laws on the state enterprise (association), the cooperative system, and individual labor activity mark major landmarks in the judicial backup of restructuring. These acts form a fairly sound legal basis for the implementation of radical economic reform.

True, it is necessary to complete the work on one further document, which would form the core of economic legislation. I am thinking of the Law on Socialist Ownership. Unless the fundamental question of the forms of this ownership under modern conditions and of the property rights and obligations of state enterprises, cooperative, and other public organizations is solved, we will not be able to renew the economic mechanism.

The situation regarding the legal support for the second central task of restructuring—the broad democratization of our social life—is more fraught. Laws on the nationwide discussion of important questions of state life and on judicial appeal against unlawful actions by officials were passed last year. The impact of those laws has been weak to date. However, many acute problems of democratic development requiring judicial decisions have accumulated. I will name just three: Glasnost, social activeness, and improvement of the state apparatus.

Glasnost and all its components—information, openness, truthfulness, and responsibility—are a powerful tool of restructuring. The indisputable achievements of the policy of glasnost, the Central Committee Theses say, need to be consolidated and augmented. This involves, for example, ensuring that information about the work of state establishments and public organizations is accessible to any citizen if it affects his interests. Information about the work of local organs of power and management, including the economic situation in a rayon, city, or oblast would be of no less significance. The publication of such social statistics must be regulated by law.

We need not only a law on glasnost but a law on the mass media. While the first would regulate relations between state and public organizations and citizens, the second would regulate relations with organs of the press, radio, and television. It is time to clearly define their rights and powers, the extent of their responsibility, the procedures for settling disputes, and to proclaim and enshrine the basic principles of journalistic ethics in law. A permanent mechanism to enable the comparison of views, criticism, and self-criticism in the party and society is required. Such a mechanism is inconceivable without legal support.

Glasnost is, it may be said, the prime and simplest expression of social activeness. The task set by the party, the task of making the management of society and the state the direct business of actual working people, demands more developed forms. One of them is the formation and functioning of formal and informal public organizations. Legal safeguards for the development of individual activity by working people presupposes the promulgation of at least two new laws: A law on voluntary societies and creative unions and a law on the right of public organizations to participate in state decision-making.

This could be another law. It is important to judicially enshrine the status of the numerous forms of working people's public activity, including rallies, demonstrations, meetings, pickets, and so forth. Highly imperfect local resolutions aimed at deterring unusual forms of public initiative only complicate the issue. Yet it is not the form assumed by the activity (for example, an undesirable demonstration) but the real causes of it that are paramount here. And it is not public activeness but the renewal of the command-and-administer system, which ultimately generate tension and discontent among citizens, that must be combated. Speaking about the nationalities problems, M.S. Gorbachev rightly observed that if negative phenomena arise in this highly sensitive sphere of human relations, they do not arise in a vacuum but arise above all from bureaucracy and disregard of legal rights.

The Theses particularly stress the vital need for the constitutional freedoms (of speech, the press, assembly, rally, street processions, and demonstration, freedom of conscience, and so forth) to be exercised.

You quite often hear it said that the whole of restructuring amounts to appointing honest, sensible workers to posts of responsibility. If only that were so. Restructuring requires the democratization of the very principles of cadre policy, the elaboration of legal procedures for the appointment and transfer of state employees, and the creation of proper judicial safeguards ensuring their operation. Marx wrote: I do not think at all that personalities should serve as safeguards against laws; on the contrary, I think that laws should serve as safeguards against personalities.

Some things are being done here. I am thinking of the system of assessment, competition, and appointment by election relating to leaders. However, even tsarist Russia had experience of regular "examinations for posts," and many foreign countries have this experience too. A law on state service would regulate this sphere of our life.

When considering the problems of legal safeguards and the implementation of the ideas of a legal state you can clearly put forward many new laws and government resolutions. But here I want to dwell again on a more general question: The question of democratizating the actual activity of law-making.

Restructuring in the sphere of legislation shows itself by enhancing the quality of existing norms and their effectiveness and scientific validity, by drawing closer to the requirements of socioeconomic development, and by deepening the democratic procedure for their formation. Legal reform is primarily bound up with enhancing the role of the law in the life of society. However the actual weight of the law is not up to the role assigned it by the constitution. Contrary to conventional wisdom, which holds that a vast quantity of laws exist, they represent a very small proportion of the overall number of normative documents.

From 1938 (after the adoption of the 1936 USSR Constitution) through 1980 the USSR Supreme Soviet passed (excluding plan and budget laws) only 144 laws, and of them 87 (63 percent) ratified previously passed USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decrees. From 1980 through 1985 48 laws were passed, of which 33 were ratification of 125 decrees. So the number of laws in the constitutional sense of the term is not so great. Basic legal regulation was carried out by decrees which, unfortunately, in a number of cases substantially amended existing legislation.

Thus, since the adoption of the Fundamentals of Criminal Legislation (1961) and criminal codes, more than 300 amendments and supplements have been introduced by decree. The Code on Administrative Violations of the Law was amended 3 times in under 2 years: 15 new sections were introduced and 35 sections amended.

A situation has arisen whereby establishments and citizens rely not on the USSR Constitution or even laws but basically on departmental legal documents, which receive de facto priority. Violation of the principle of the supremacy of the law disorganizes the system, undermines the authority of the laws, and causes law-enforcement activity to malfunction.

Reform of the legal system must ensure the supremacy of the Constitution within the structure of sources of the law, the direct and immediate operation of constitutional norms, and enhance the role of the law.

Since 1958, when the legislative rights of union republics were extended, excessive centralization of legislative activity has again prevailed. Virtually all the acts, of varying degrees of importance, passed in the seventies and eighties were passed by union organs. Here the republic acts (constitutions, civil, criminal, procedural, housing, and other codes) were prepared as a rule according to a single model, without adequate consideration of specific local conditions. Unfortunately, this still goes on. Such practice does not strengthen a sense of national self-awareness, independence, or initiative and leads to stagnation and deformation in the sphere of national and interrepublic relations.

Existing shortcomings can hardly be removed if the procedure for creating norms is not radically altered. The principles governing the **preparation of draft** normative acts should first and foremost be revised and the process thoroughly democratized.

The Constitution of the USSR and the constitutions of union and autonomous republics set up a clear system for examining draft laws. The whole point of the system is to take account to the fullest possible extent of the interests of different classes, groups, and strata of society and to enhance the effectiveness of the law as the embodiment of the will of the state as a whole. However, over the decades these principles have been systematically violated. The preparation of draft government laws, decrees, resolutions, and other normative acts is even now mostly carried out in camera, inside the executive organs. Draft laws are prepared as follows: The Gosplan deals with planning, Gossnab deals with supplies, and so forth, naturally primarily reflecting their own departmental interests. Draft laws, with the exception of rare cases of nationwide discussion, fall within the domain of Supreme Soviet deputies—the actual legislators—only shortly before the session and after they have been approved in the directive bodies.

Only the most recent session, when a number of items were thoroughly discussed in detail in the commissions of the chambers, proved a happy exception.

But drafts of governmental decrees, resolutions, and, in particular, departmental acts—and they are in the majority—are prepared exclusively in the executive organs and are not generally discussed democratically in advance. The secret, departmental nature of the preparation of normative acts does not make it possible to take into account diverse social interests. Hence the poor quality of the acts and the inconsistency of many of them.

The main way to improve the creation of norms is to thoroughly democratize it. Draft laws and decrees must be mainly prepared in the legislative proposals commissions and the working groups set up by them. The commissions should be supplemented by deputies with good legal training. Drafts must be sent for finalization to the interested management bodies, competent scientific establishments, and party organs. When differences occur between drafts and final versions, the definitive decision must be made by the legislative proposals commission and a report on both the draft and the differences submitted to the Supreme Soviet. I think that decrees of a normative nature should also be prepared by the same procedure, although without submission to a session.

The main way to democratize legislative work is to involve soviet deputies in it. The practice of passing laws ratifying Supreme Soviet Presidium decrees without active discussion of them by deputies dilutes the democratic potential of the Supreme Soviet. It is clearly expedient to introduce the procedure adopted in many countries of a "second reading" of draft laws at sessions and to ensure free discussion of draft laws regarding amendments submitted, and to ensure that no law affecting citizens' constitutional rights, freedoms, or obligations can be passed in the form of a decree but must without fail be discussed by deputies, in the legislative proposals commission, and then at a session of the Supreme Soviet.

Improvement of the procedure for informing citizens and officials about the texts of laws is an essential condition for democratization of the legal system. The prevailing legal-information system has led to many important resolutions concerning various spheres of social life, particularly those regulating the activity and mutual relations of enterprises, associations, and ministries and other management organs in the conditions of restructuring of the economic mechanism, being virtually "classified as secret" and withdrawn from wide practical and scientific use. This leads to a paucity of information about the latest legislation and renders previously published acts unreliable, since there is no guarantee that they have not been superseded by later acts that have not been made public.

At a rough estimate, only 32.5 percent of all resolutions of a normative nature promulgated by the USSR Government in 1985-1986 were published in the Collection of Resolutions. From 1980 (the beginning of publications "in resume") through 1987 12.5 percent of resolutions were given in resume form. I will give a quite recent example. The USSR Council of Ministers passed a resolution on restructuring Gossnab's structure and activity. It contains not only a series of norms regulating Gossnab's work but the procedure for the material and technical supply of enterprises and economic associations under the new conditions. The resolution was not published even in resume. The same situation exists with the list of government resolutions superseded by the Law on the Enterprise.

This practice, built up over the years under administrative and bureaucratic methods of leadership, the absence of glasnost, and disregard of the requirements of legality, became an integral part of the braking mechanism, without the destruction of which restructuring and further improvement of social relations are impossible, since a considerable proportion of the government resolutions formally in force have in point of fact not been implemented for a long time... This deprives economic organizations and labor collectives of a firm legal basis for independent and resourceful management, creates grounds for violation of legality and the constant "reproduction" of administrative methods of leadership, and hampers the further improvement of legislation, putting a considerable part of it outside the "zone of criticism."

It is essential to clearly define the range of acts of the USSR Government, union republic councils of ministries, and ministries and departments **subject to mandatory publication in relevant official publications.**

The timetable for publication of government resolutions and departmental normative acts should be set by analogy with the procedure for the publication and entry into force of legislative acts of the Supreme Soviets of the USSR and union republics and their presidiums. The following invariable principle must operate here: Acts not published in accordance with set procedure **cannot possess force of law.**

The functions of monitoring the practical implementation of laws and the social results of their operation must be accelerated as part of the activity of the USSR Supreme Soviet and union and autonomous republic supreme soviets. The present forms of monitoring are not in tune with the spirit of the times.

Open sittings of the Supreme Soviet and its commissions—public hearings devoted to the analysis of the application of existing normative acts, with the participation of citizens and representatives of public and state organizations—could serve as a form of monitoring. The combination of representative and direct democracy during such sessions will afford legislators the opportunity to subject their activity to critical analysis from the population.

The USSR Constitution lays down that monitoring of its observance is carried out by the USSR Supreme Soviet and its Presidium. However, the necessary mechanism for carrying out such monitoring is lacking and no procedural rules have been drawn up. I think that the proposals made in the press that a constitutional court be set up in our country or that the USSR Supreme Court be invested with such powers are correct.

The democratization of all aspects of our social life, including the judicial system, is an urgent imperative of our times, an objective requirement of restructuring, and a guarantee of its irreversability. Restructuring and democracy are the route to a qualitatively new state of Soviet society and a new aspect of socialism.

Colonel Views Uneasy Militia-Media Relationship

PM0206100588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 May 88 Second Edition p 3

[Article by Colonel of Internal Service B. Mikhaylov, chief of the USSR MVD Press Bureau: "Caution: Sensationalism! A Crime Specialist's Reflections on 'Criminal' Topics"—boldface as published]

[Text] **I personally am all in favor of sensationalism. You could not imagine newspapers without it. But there is another aspect to it: What is behind the sensationalism, behind the garish facade of luridness? How trustworthy is this material?**

Leafing through yellowing bound copies of newspapers from the seventies, at times I catch myself thinking a seditious thought: All this material from the stagnation period about the militia, is it beneficial or harmful? This huge volume of stereotype newspaper output, glorifying irreproachable detectives and perspicacious leaders of rayon militia departments.... But why? Simply because journalists' attempts to speak openly about the dark side of things were firmly blocked.

Yes, from the height of today's glasnost and restructuring process it is possible to see what a deformed impression people were given about the complex situation within the militia in the late seventies.... What a vast gap existed between the information available to the "elite" and the minimal proportion of it which reached ordinary people. Hence the rumors, the breach of real contacts between the public and the militia, the exclusiveness and certain secrecy practiced by subunits at various levels.

Furthermore, direct use was often made of contacts with press and television for narrow selfish purposes to extol and even glorify some MVD leaders.

And suddenly, the floodgates seemed to burst open. In the wake of April 1985 we "suddenly" discovered in our country drug addicts, prostitutes, and corruption (even in the militia); almost every newspaper issue published some sensational material.

Glasnost cast light on problems which were being concealed, or rather hushed up, and we all experienced a sort of intellectual shock. But strange as it may seem, the militia was the first to come to its senses. Its best and healthy cadres, that is, who realized that glasnost contains a tremendous force. It was probably no accident that Militia Captain V. Zhura from Chernigov wrote in PRAVDA and appealed to his colleagues: "Let us converse without ambitions!" And the result of the ensuing conversation was that the USSR MVD repealed more than 1,500 outdated bureaucratic instructions which were harmful to real work! It embarked on cutbacks in the management apparatus, which had become an obstacle in the way of true professionals

Yes, it is extremely unpleasant for someone wearing the militia shoulder boards to read what his "colleagues" are doing at times. You feel bitter and ashamed. But any hushing up inevitably entails consequences like those we observed in the law-enforcement sphere in Central Asia, Volgograd, Krasnodar.... No, today we realize that glasnost and the utmost openness of information are an absolute norm for socialist society.

In this context we profoundly welcome any initiative by journalists striving to help us sweep clean our own backyard, just as we welcome purely working contacts like joint inspections and operations. We strictly take to task those staffers of ours who try to ignore the work of the press and even to obstruct journalists. This, frankly speaking, is not a rare occurrence. In Kirghizia, for example—and even after April 1985—we came across a scandalous fact: Only 2 of the 16 published articles

critical of republic MVD subunits were promptly discussed, with a reply sent to the editorial offices. Comrades from the Novgorod Internal Affairs Administration failed to respond promptly to the article "Pilferers" in NOVGORODSKAYA PRAVDA. Furthermore, the criticism was properly perceived only after one of the central newspapers wrote about it!

But glasnost also imposes the most serious obligations on journalists. Facts carry tremendous weight today, and this is why they have to be thoroughly verified. Journalists do not always succeed in doing this, especially when they wish to get the information to their readers more quickly.

Here is a typical example. On 28 April 1988 several newspapers carried reports on one and the same incident—the detention of a criminal who had wounded Militia Senior Lieutenant A. Moiseyev and had, according to eyewitnesses, corrupted a minor.

One newspaper wrote one thing, another wrote something else, and yet another wrote something else again. The mistakes concerned minor details, but they become particularly important in such a sensitive area as legal reporting. Readers in their hundreds, not to say thousands, wrote to the newspaper editorial offices and to us in the ministry, asking: "Who is right?" A petty inaccuracy engendered great mistrust in published material in principle.

PRAVDA also devoted part of a page to this incident, publishing a report entitled "Detention" and containing accurate and objective information. This accuracy is the result of its journalist enlisting the help of a professional—Militia Colonel P. Soin, chief of Moscow's Timiryazevskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Administration, who was directly in charge of the militia subunits which carried out the detention operation. Furthermore, the newspaper also deemed it necessary to consult both the USSR MVD Press Bureau and the prosecutor's office.

But here is a curious phenomenon: Mistakes in other newspapers generated mistrust also in PRAVDA, as evidenced by the ironical reader's letter published by OGONEK (No 21, May 1988). As a matter of fact, the journal itself does not make it clear who was right, and thus provides grounds for mistrust in all mass news media. It itself is guilty of an inaccuracy by asking through its reader: Why was the city of Dolgoprudnyy brought up in the PRAVDA article? If the comrade from OGONEK who prepared the letter for publication had read the text of the article, he would have realized that it was to Dolgoprudnyy that the wounded militia officer was sent....

But even this reader's letter is also "sensational." What else—after all, PRAVDA itself is being blamed for inaccuracies which, as it was proved, never existed.

The lengthy article "The Many Faces of the Militia" published by YUNOST (No 3, 1988) also errs on the side of inaccuracies and juggling with facts. Its author is Geliy Ryabov, former staff member of the USSR MVD system. Wittingly or not, he takes two or three sentences from several interviews with ministry leaders out of context and offers his own interpretation of them. The meaning he imparts, for example, to words spoken by Militia Colonel V. Yerin or to part of a sentence said by the author of this article totally distorts them. V. Yerin advocates the introduction of the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution in the detection of criminals, but Geliy Ryabov actually accuses him of the opposite. The result is a distorted view of various problems faced by law-enforcement organs presented, apparently, by.... "the stigmatized conservatives and dogmatists..." themselves.

An authoritative journal published a feature about outrages committed by the militia. The facts are accurate. The language is juicy. The journalist is talented and occupies humanitarian and charitable positions. But he has naively forgotten to mention just one point: The fact that these events are 8 years old. That the characters in his feature were exposed by the militia and prosecutor's office and have been serving their sentences for a long time now. But—it's a sensation.... And readers think: All this is happening now, and the outrages were discovered by the journalist himself....

As a matter of fact, journalists are also human, and they are liable to make not quite accurate assessments. But glasnost should not resemble a one-sided game. Let the adherents of as many concepts as possible have their say. But this is not happening yet. The editorial offices of respected newspapers, television, and radio seem unable to give up "the right to have the last word."

This is also understandable. I am convinced that, in the same way as the militia, which realized the strength of and support for glasnost and opened up its "hiding places," the news media will realize that truth lies in the multiplicity of viewpoints. But the situation today is still the same—a "one-sided game." And I would like to see the best-qualified referee—the opinion of a large number of readers and viewers—actually allowed onto "the field of play."

Journalists and militiamen—paradoxical as it may seem—pursue one and the same goal. The right to express a competent point of view. They both consider themselves professionals and are guided by this. The detective is armed with the "magnifying glass" and the "criminal code." The journalist is armed with the ability to understand people, personal experience, objectivity, and lack of prejudice.... But what if all this is simply nonexistent? And a journalist is morally shortsighted and stoops to cheap sensationalism? Is this so unimaginable—or, to put it bluntly, does it not actually happen?

Alas, it does. But while an investigator or detective proved guilty of unprofessional conduct is at times dismissed, the journalist is backed by his newspaper's prestige. The main thing is to ensure that the facts "actually occurred" and the newspaper's prestige will take care of the rest....

The process of restructuring, democratization, and glasnost forces us all to conduct an increasingly active quest for levers to activate the still dormant potential of cooperation between the press and internal affairs organs. In my view, very few central echelon newspapers are at present exerting any serious influence on the restructuring of the legal mechanism. (Not by themselves, of course, but with help of their mass readership.) As for the majority, they are following the path of "sensationalism." Of course, good "reading matter" is also necessary. But what we need is the stance, analysis, and organizational activity of the journalist. As much as we need active support from the press today in the practical matters of restructuring: a serious analysis of organized crime, juvenile crime, and the embezzlement of socialist property.

Today we offer journalists as much information as possible. We hide nothing, apart from just particular facts while a specific case is under investigation. (I am convinced that the time will soon come when absolutely all criminal statistics will be made available to glasnost!) However, either because the force of inertia is too great or because our services are not functioning properly in places, journalists do not come to us to verify and check facts but grab whatever comes to hand first and descend on a sensational incident like a flash of lightning, without bothering to do a little digging or thinking....

But life insists on this. Not only to think and foresee better, but also to forecast crime and its moral consequences. Maybe we are simply still incapable of doing this work? So let us learn. From each other.

Let us give this some thought. Otherwise the huge amount of material on legal matters, often without any ideological, moral, or political charge, might give us a distorted view of, so to say, the legal reality. A narrow-minded view of the essence of this reality. In my view, restructuring is unimaginable without truth in every respect.

...Just three figures. In 1986, the central press alone carried more than 800 ite[illegible] on the militia's problems. More than 1,000 in 1987. In the first few months of this year, the press as a whole (including television and radio) has already carried almost 800! Obviously, this swelling mass of re[illegible]demands greater responsibility by journalists and [illegible]gans for every line they publish. Because one-t[illegible] the published items have produced "complaints." [illegible], not by the militia—by readers: "Mistake!"

We are not talking about exerting pressure on journalists' personal opinions and viewpoints. By no means!

Today we can frankly say: The press has given and continues to give the militia tremendous support in cleansing its ranks of all sorts of timeservers, hypocrites, and downright traitors. We expect this help to continue in the future. And we are strictly taking to task (right up to dismissal from office) those who try to silence journalists. We are in favor of the utmost frankness and glasnost. The only thing we ask for is the utmost accuracy and factological discipline. It is probably impossible to work in any different fashion today, in the epoch of glasnost.

Official Cited on Emigration, Immigration

PM0706112188 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 22, 28 May-3 Jun 88 (Signed to Press 26 May 88) p 8

[Interview with R.A. Kuznetsov, chief of the USSR MVD Visa and Registration Department, by correspondent N. Zyatkov: "Travel Abroad. About 40,000 Persons Left the USSR in 1987 To Establish Residence Abroad"; date and place not given—first two paragraphs are ARGUMENTY I FAKTY introduction]

[Text] Hundreds of thousands of Soviet people travel abroad on personal business. An almost equal number of foreign citizens visit the Soviet Union. Some leave our country forever; others, on the other hand, arrive to establish permanent residence in the USSR. What problems exist around these processes?

Our correspondent N. Zyatkov talks with R.A. Kuznetsov, chief of the USSR MVD Visa and Registration Department.

N. Zyatkov: The "radio voices" love to talk about "USSR emigration policy" in different periods of history. Their talks are often scathing. Evidently, however, there are shortcomings in this sphere, and they ought to be discussed not only behind closed office doors, since we are talking about matters like USSR citizens' rights and dignity and our state's prestige. What can you say in this context?

R. Kuznetsov: It would be incorrect to claim that there are neither problems nor grounds to improve our work. And even though they affect only a small proportion of Soviet citizens, this does not change the essence of the matter. Speaking about the legal basis, it is well known that the Soviet Union has joined the International Pact on Civil and Political Rights (something that the United States has not yet done), all 10 principles of the Helsinki Final Act are incorporated in our Constitution, there have been appropriate amendments to legal documents regulating questions of entry and exit for family reunion purposes, the time taken to deal with such applications has been reduced, and the fees paid to the state only if permission to depart is granted have been halved.

After the Bern Conference, the principles contained in the final document which was backed by the USSR (and was boycotted by the United States) were nevertheless incorporated in our practice.

N. Zyatkov: Rudolf Alekseyevich, could you give some data on the number of people who have left our country during the postwar years? What is their national composition? How many have entered the USSR in that time?

R. Kuznetsov: If we speak of the total number of those who have left throughout the postwar years, then there have been approximately 500,000 of them.

Approximately 300,000 citizens have entered our country. This process was especially active in the postwar years. But as you know, it is still going on. As a matter of fact, more than 1,000 have recently returned. For example, we have families returning from the FRG that had departed not only in previous years but even as recently as January-february of this year. Incidentally, we are asking those who return, in the same way as we ask those who depart, to obtain the consent of those with whom they intend to live in the Soviet Union. The reason is clear—not to infringe on the interests of relatives and other Soviet citizens, especially in terms of housing, which is still so complex for us. For example, a citizen wanted to return to his wife but she withheld her consent. Such is life. Relatives of a former resident of Leningrad refused to take him back on his return from the United States. Thus it happened that more than 40 persons left the USSR again for the second time, after spending some time here.

As regards national composition, those departing are basically of Jewish, German, and Armenian nationality. This is evidently attributable to the fact that, for various reasons, these are the nationalities with the largest number of divided families. Departure by persons of other nationalities is basically linked with marriage to foreigners.

This often occurs as a result of what could be lack of discrimination in relations with foreigners, or ignorance of the conditions and life-style in some countries. The break with relatives and friends places many women and their children in a most difficult moral and physical position. At times this even leads to tragic consequences. As she declared at the time, a 30-year-old woman who left last February to join her husband in France was unable to endure the trials of emigration and attempted to commit suicide. Subsequently, having decided to return to Moscow and only 4 hours prior to her departure, she nevertheless took her own life by jumping out of a seventh-story window.

N. Zyatkov: What are the reasons given in applications to leave the USSR and take up permanent residence in other countries? Who can and who cannot leave?

R. Kuznetsov: The regulations on entry into the USSR and exit from the USSR (see CHELOVEK I ZAKON No 2, 1987) state that applications to leave in order to establish permanent residence abroad are examined subject to submission of an invitation by the applicant's father, mother, husband, wife, daughter, son, brother, or sister.

As regards husbands and wives, we are talking mainly about marriages to foreigners, which are quite numerous. More than 12,000 Soviet citizens (mainly women) have left the USSR in the last few years. At the same time, many foreigners among those who marry USSR citizens apply for permission to establish permanent residence in the Soviet Union. This is a natural process, this is life.

N. Zyatkov: And is the invitation limited only to the range of relatives you mentioned?

R. Kuznetsov: Those wishing to leave can apply for the departure of relatives and disabled dependents who live with them in a joint household. This is done for humanitarian reasons, so as not to break established ties and divide families.

It happens at times that someone has no relatives at all in our country, but does have, for example, an uncle, aunt, or other relatives living abroad and they invite him to join them. Such applications are also examined.

N. Zyatkov: So, is an invitation "from over there" all that is necessary?

R. Kuznetsov: There are differing opinions on this. I personally look at invitations as a kind of guarantee that a person will be assured of acceptable living conditions in the country to which he is traveling. Our society cannot simply abandon someone to his fate. After all, a desire to leave sometimes arises through various upheavals at work or in the family, even temporary ones. I have met such people on many occasions. I would not like to give their names but, believe me, once everything has been settled they work normally and live in the motherland—and this is very important.

During the Geneva session (February-March this year) of the Human Rights Commission, Israeli Ambassador Eliav and even representatives of some Western countries claimed that the USSR is "detaining" 375,000 Jews who allegedly wish to leave our country and have received their invitations. These are empty words. We accept and examine all applications by USSR citizens submitted according to established procedures. The number of applicants to leave our country has never been anywhere near this figure.

For those interested in statistics, I can state that 7,862 adults and 2,109 minors left for Israel in 1987. The number is significantly greater than in 1986.

At the same time, last year 334 persons who had been given permission to leave for Israel declined this permission and filed statements with the internal affairs organs. This is five times as many as in 1986.

Furthermore, about 300 of those who had left for Israel in the past returned to the USSR in 1987. The process of immigration to the Soviet Union from other countries has also increased. Some 696 foreigners came here to establish permanent residence.

N. Zyatkov: What other documents are required to process an application to leave in order to establish permanent residence?

R. Kuznetsov: In addition to the invitation, it is necessary to submit notarized declarations by family members remaining in the USSR and by former spouses (if there are minors from a previous marriage) that the person wishing to leave has no outstanding obligations toward them under USSR laws. This guarantees the constitutional rights of citizens remaining in the USSR. We must consider the interests of children and parents. Article 66 of the USSR Constitution reads: "Citizens of the USSR are obliged to concern themselves with the upbringing of children, to train them for socially useful work, and to raise them as worthy members of socialist society. Children are obliged to care for their parents and to help them."

But not all applicants always remember this. At times these people leave their elderly parents alone. And even worse: They forcibly choose their children's future way of life. Therefore, in order to protect the interests of children between the ages of 14 and 18, it has been established that they must express their will in written and notarized form.

But even so, parents and children at times make hasty decisions. Last April a 15-year-old boy left to establish permanent residence with his father abroad. Unable to withstand the gross behavior of his alcoholic father—who, moreover, threw him out of the house—he recently returned to rejoin his mother in the USSR.

We have started receiving applications from even younger children. Here is one of them: "My father and mother want to leave for Israel and take my brother and me with them, but I don't want to go there. Please, help me!" Unfortunately, this girl is only a fourth-grader and it is only her parents who can heed her opinion.

At the same time, those wishing to leave the USSR to establish permanent residence abroad are no longer required to submit a notarized declaration regarding outstanding obligations to children, brothers, or sisters remaining in the USSR if the latter do not live with them as part of the same household.

When the departure is to a country with which the USSR has concluded treaties on legal aid, no declarations by family members are required.

I would like to mention that the practice of requiring those who wish to establish permanent residence abroad to submit certificates asserting the absence of outstanding debts to rental facilities, telephone exchanges, and so on has been deemed incorrect and has been abandoned.

In my view, all these issues must be resolved not by the militia but through building operation boards and other housing and municipal service organizations before the accommodation is vacated by whoever is departing.

N. Zyatkov: We know well the difficulties encountered by those who leave to establish permanent residence in the West. But each one of them is hoping for something better. And so, the final choice has been made. But permission is refused for some reason. Are there many such cases today?

R. Kuznetsov: We are by no means the only country with restrictions on the departure of its citizens abroad. In the Netherlands, for example, there is a certain number of civil servants who could be forbidden to travel to socialist countries by the BVD, the local special service. Similar restrictions are imposed by legislation in other capitalist countries.

All decisions in our country are made by local internal affairs organs. Those who are refused permission can, under current regulations, reapply for an exit permit after 6 months. It must be said that, between 1986 and the present, permission has been given to 34,000 of the citizens who had earlier been refused permission. This is a dynamic process. There are no provisions in our country to the effect that a refusal is final.

It also happens that certain restrictions no longer apply to some people, but that they have changed their minds and no longer wish to leave. I have already cited figures on this account. In particular, after the Khodorovich family was given the opportunity to leave for abroad of which they had dreamed, the mother of the wife of the head of the family submitted a written statement 28 March 1987 which said: "I am 75 years old and I will live the rest of my life here. I ask that the application for an exit permit that I signed be canceled."

There are people to whose departure the internal affairs organs raise no objections, but they either have not settled matters with their relatives, owe material debts to their employer, or have other outstanding obligations.

The number of refusals is sharply declining, and at present represents 2.5 percent.

As a rule, the figures circulating in the West about the number of "refuseniks" are speculative. This is indicated by—aside from anything else—the fact that some of the

people on the lists presented by Western politicians have already left the USSR, while many have given up their intention to leave the country.

N. Zyatkov: You come into contact with people who are about to forsake the motherland. How would you describe this category of citizens?

R. Kuznetsov: When talking to people who have applied for permission to leave the USSR we try to explain the problems they may encounter in the future and give them an opportunity to think things over once more, to reconsider everything. Once I received a woman from Tula Oblast who was intending to go with her husband to Jamaica, taking her young child with her. I advised her to leave on a temporary basis, and make her final decision later. How could I describe those wishing to leave? I personally feel sorry for them. Especially the elderly, those who have spent their lives here, who have worked and brought benefit to our state, and are now forced by someone's influence to leave.

You also come across people who are dissatisfied with everything, who have heard something somewhere, but have absolutely no idea of the whole depth of problems that stem from losing one's motherland.

N. Zyatkov: Do you receive complaints addressed to monitoring organs? Are many of the decisions made locally reviewed by you here, in Moscow?

R. Kuznetsov: You name it, we get it. Of course, the majority of people exercise their rights and ask for explanations, but some immediately start looking for protectors abroad. As for reviews, I cannot say that there are many of them, but we do have them. At times people at local level cannot investigate everything, it also happens that citizens give incorrect information.... People at times feel that have not been treated objectively and they appeal to us, the higher-ranking office—that is their right.

At times, when filing their documents, people try to deceive us and we have to check and recheck, wasting our time. We have, on the one hand, loud words about infringement of rights and, on the other hand, elementary dishonesty. Here is a case. A young man, having only just completed his army service, came to me with a complaint that he was not being allowed to leave the USSR to join his parents. We started looking into the case, reopened the file, and it appeared that, at the time of their departure, neither his father nor his mother had mentioned him on the application form; they had renounced their living son. Can you imagine how he reacted to that? So where is the honesty and humanitarianism here?

These people at times accuse us of bureaucratism and callousness, but some of these "defenders" of humanitarianism have departed, leaving behind sick or pregnant wives, without waiting for the birth of their children and without giving any help to the young mothers.

Here is another case: A wife who had long been hesitating over whether to leave or not was finally persuaded by her husband to do so. Soon afterward he abandoned her there, and she spent many years in and out of psychiatric clinics. By the way, many such people now love to use words like democracy and glasnost, forgetting that you must earn the moral right to use them.

This is why I believe that no laws or instructions can replace a face-to-face conversation. After all, some families are reunited while others are separated: The husband's parents leave, while the wife's parents stay behind. This means that they will be unable to see their daughter and grandchildren as often as they would like. Is that right in their old age?

N. Zyatkov: Nevertheless, what is the procedure for examining complaints and applications on these matters?

R. Kuznetsov: Internal affairs organs have now been instructed to supply citizens on request with written answers about the outcome of an examination of applications for permission to establish permanent residence abroad. The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium monitors the legality and justification of internal affairs organs' decisions refusing permission to leave for permanent residence abroad.

N. Zyatkov: It is said in the West that "more people are now being allowed to leave the USSR." Last year VOA gave the figure of 3,000 people in 6 months. But this, it said, was still not enough.

R. Kuznetsov: "Voices" will be "voices....." As for VOA's figure, it is five times too low. About 40,000 persons received permission to leave in 1987. This is 5.3 times more than in 1986. More than 20,000 persons have received permission in the first 4 months of this year.

N. Zyatkov: Rudolf Alekseyevich, there are citizens who are trying to leave but are refused permission. Even "demonstrations" and "hunger strikes" are organized about this. Therefore, in our readers' opinion, they should be given an opportunity to leave as soon as possible, there is no point in "keeping" them here....

R. Kuznetsov: As a rule, those who organize "demonstrations" and "hunger strikes" know well why they have so far been refused permission. Therefore these are underhand methods, attempts to pressure us and at times even to earn the money by which they are maintained by various "foundations."

What does it mean, "they should not be kept here"? What if they have knowledge of information that could damage our state's security? It is no coincidence that individuals arriving in some countries from the USSR take a long time to "adapt" in special places where they are thoroughly interrogated by foreign intelligence services.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY note] You can read about private travel abroad in one of our next issues.

Moscow City Trade Union Council Holds Session

LD0406160588 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 4 Jun 88

[Text] A plenum of the Moscow City Trade Union Council was held in Moscow today. A report of the council presidium on the work on management of restructuring and on the work of trade unions organizations was examined. The main attention was focused on insuring the social and legal protection of the working people and also on activation of the work to implement economic reform and assert self-management in production. The participants in the plenum noted that profound and stable changes have not occurred as yet in the work of many trade unions organizations. Measures were mapped out on raising actionability [boyevitost] of the trade unions and enhancing their protective function by quicker mastering of new forms of work on the basis of glasnost.

PRAVDA Readers Ponder Party Democracy

PM0906095588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jun 88 Second Edition p 2

[T. Samolis article under the rubric "Reading the Mail": "Cleansing by Means of the Truth"]

[Text] I recall how in a response to a roundup of readers' letters entitled "Cleansing" [PRAVDA, 13 February 1986] I found some words that were surprisingly penetrating: "When my grandmother read the article she began weeping and said: 'At last truth is about to enter our life. Open the door and let it in.'"

Yes, restructuring is inconceivable without truth, without glasnost, and without a frank exchange of opinions and views. Whichever newspaper or journal you pick up now, you find debates and discussions everywhere. That is natural: We are all studying democracy and, as it were, regaining the right to speak. The entire country has been set in motion, our whole society. So many things are happening around us!

There is much that that we are still not used to, much that we view from the standpoint of stereotype, but we are no longer the way we used to be. Could what happened to the review entitled "Cleansing" have happened 2 years ago with today's level of glasnost? I still cannot forget the telephone call from my father, a war veteran and an old Communist. He asked: "My daughter, is it true that your review has been called harmful and denigratory and that you have been fired?" Of course this was untrue but how much some functionaries would have liked to settle scores with the author for daring to quote in the newspaper an extract from a worker's letter that spoke about the bureaucratic stratum acting as a brake on restructuring.

Having thrown the door wide open to truth, we are now speaking freely about our shortcomings and the need to revive socialism's Leninist aspect. But how is this to be done in practical terms and how is inertia to be overcome after so many years of domination by cults and cultists [kultik]—after all, was not the most regrettable feature of the long period of stagnation that people lost the habit of creative thinking and of perceiving the indissoluble dialectical unity of word and deed?

The editorial mailbag is society's nerve that quickly responds to the most important events of our life and unerringly indicates what our readers think, how they live, what they want, and what their fears are on the eve of the party conference. Of course, these letters do contain flaws and contentious points. But people are writing sincerely and from the bottom of their hearts. They are confiding their most important thoughts, sometimes their innermost thoughts, and they are entitled to hope that their voice will be heard.

"I impatiently await a lesson in glasnost and truth from the all-union party conference," N. Kuznetsova writes from Kiev. "My wish is for the renewal of our party at the new historical stage and the establishment of the truly democratic traditions of the political leadership of restructuring."

The editorial mailbag contains quite a few letters on the need to enhance the party's prestige. But the strange thing is that the more frankly the writers' personal opinions are expressed, the more often they are accompanied by the rider: "Even though we have glasnost here I know that you will not publish my letter." However regrettable it may be, there is a long-standing, deeply-held conviction that anything critical of the party's affairs is not for publication. "We all approach the problem of the party's role very gingerly, we pussyfoot around it," N. Kuznetsova remarks, "we are wary of it but the people see everything and for that reason do not have complete faith in restructuring and its irreversibility."

We should not be surprised at that—for many years people have been taught to regard the party and its leadership only by looking up. The leaders were invariably "wise," the people always approved their decisions "unanimously," and we were all united, of course, by "monolithic cohesion." During the long years of stagnation we sometimes saw so much adulation and empty eulogizing of top leaders that we simply ceased to be receptive and in many respects lost faith entirely.

It would seem that the verbal acrobatics are over now in the period of glasnost and the development of democracy. But what about the "Kunayev affair." On 16 March 1987, PRAVDA wrote that the participants in the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee Plenum had concluded that the former Central Committee first secretary must be made answerable to the party for his flagrant violations of the norms of party life, distortions of cadre policy, manifestations of total license, and so on. What happened, readers ask, did the plenum participants' opinion go unanswered, did it disappear like water into sand?

There are more examples, and quite recent ones. In the 4th year of restructuring we saw two short newspaper reports printed one above the other that the first secretaries of the Azerbaijan and Armenian Communist Party Central Committees have retired on health grounds. That day the editorial office telephone did not stop ringing—people said with bitter irony: It's the same old refrain, as though the people are stupid and naive enough not to understand the true reasons for the simultaneous removal from high posts of officials who had tolerated an extraordinary situation in the region. Was it really impossible to speak openly and honestly about that?

A few days passed and more news arrived: The first secretary of Sakhalin party obkom is retiring unexpectedly. Once again there was the official phrase about health even though the local mass media and later SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA carried grave critical comments on that secretary's style of leadership.

Any cover up or half-truth is a political and social evil, because it undermines faith even in the best of intentions and gives rise to skepticism. And it will long hang around our feet like heavy shackles until each of us sees and experiences real changes for ourselves. And the people link those changes first and foremost with the affairs of their party and its political leadership of restructuring.

It cannot be denied that in the past, the quite recent past, the question of confidence and the support of party decisions was absolutely clear cut. It was taken for granted that every step by the party is unanimously supported and approved by the people. It seemed that there could be no other opinions. But life is not like that. Every idea—naturally—has its supporters and its opponents. But the kind of discussion in which only one view is made known and the rest are silenced has nothing at all to do with democracy.

"Everything which the Soviet Union has achieved," Communist A. Orlov from Moscow writes, "it has achieved under the CPSU's leadership. But I am constantly troubled by the question: How could it be that the party was unable to prevent the situation in which a country with a progressive system came to the brink of economic crisis. And why was it that the party, whose strength derives from the fact that it is not afraid now to reveal mistakes and to publicly admit them, was incapable just recently of preventing a loss of belief, the erosion of moral values, apathy, and alienation? It is distressing and shameful for our great state. I am convinced that the people are capable of everything and can overcome everything but that first of all the party apparatus needs a fundamental restructuring to prevent a return to the past. Otherwise nothing sensible will emerge from restructuring...."

M. Khodorich from Fastov continues and enlarges on that idea: "People's faith in Stalin resulted from inertia deriving from their faith in Lenin. Sometimes people do not trust Gorbachev out of inertia from their lack of faith in his talentless predecessor. It is very difficult for Mikhail Sergeyevich now, I understand that. To be honest, the former party leadership offended many people and its appearance was gradually transformed from the attractive heroic image of the fighter for justice into the arrogant face of the party bureaucrat."

When expressing concern for the fate of restructuring, PRAVDA readers campaign for the creation of the conditions in the party and society which would prevent the recurrence in our life of leader worship [vozhdizm], ultimate authorities, and unbridled power often leading to a basic lawlessness. "In 50 years we have moved from one cult to another. You cannot take an easy short cut to democracy while forgetting about the implantation in society of fear, violence, and self-glorification even to the point of monuments erected during the subject's lifetime. There must be a thorough restructuring and an understanding by party workers that democracy is incompatible with partocracy [partokratiya]. Otherwise what you have is not democracy but a monster." That extract comes from Muscovite V. Mironov's letter.

Here is what CPSU member V. Dubovenko from Kiev writes.

"The party's ideological work, as far as I can judge, was extremely poor under Suslov and efforts were directed not at improving it but at glorifying the figure of Brezhnev. I am profoundly sure that all these cults are created because someone at one time produced the vile theory that our people cannot live without a tsar and that if there is no tsar they must have a leader [vozhd]. We are talking a lot now about the negative phenomena of the past. And we are right to do so. Because unless we understand the reasons that caused them there will be no progress. And it is even more important for us to consider the future in order to ensure that there is no repetition of the past. We can do that if we take the path of democratizing our life not just in words but in deeds and if we prevent cults at all levels in the future."

Engineer S. Ponomarev from Dalmatovo is convinced that there must first be a truly democratic system of elections so as to eliminate the conditions in which the cult of the personality "grew up." "The CPSU Central

Committee Theses for the 19th all-union party conference say that elected leading posts in the party and the soviets must be for no more than two terms. But even here, as of old, there is the reservation on the possibility of a third term for especially outstanding figures. Why this loophole?"

"Life has repeatedly confirmed," PRAVDA reader V. Velikanov from Leningrad writes, "that few people have withstood the test of power for a long time. Party or state leadership for life is the lot of countries that are poorly developed spiritually and economically. You cannot say that about our state. The Soviet people are politically mature enough to have the right to the real election of their leaders and to take a more effective part themselves in the running of the country."

Authority is created not by power, not by office, and not by membership of the ruling party. Three years passed and what remained of the power of the Rashidovs, the Shchelokovs, and their ilk? Only the nagging pain caused by the fact that those people preached at us and controlled our lives. The power of authority—that is where the direct road toward trust begins. And toward ensuring that people follow the Communist and trust him. And that power is determined not by the nomenklatura system and not by the office for which, unfortunately, you have to be a [party] member, a deputy, or the holder of an order marking your boss' anniversary. This power is democratic and the most durable because people support it.

"A strict hierarchy still persists in the party," notes V. Dragun from Chita. "It is no secret that the vast majority of Communists take merely a formal part in the formulation of its policy. Only the leadership is the real generator of ideas. I believe that these ideas would be more interesting and more productive if the top party echelon paid more attention to voices from below. Rank-and-file Communists are sometimes deprived of the opportunity to make decisions and do not have free access to information. Can this really be normal in conditions of the democratic rights that are being proclaimed? The struggle of ideas is normal and natural. Whereas the struggle against ideas inevitably transforms those ideas into dogma. That is why, in my view, the current law's restrictions on any activity should be lifted as long as that activity is not aimed at changing the country's sociopolitical system."

Glasnost is inconceivable, PRAVDA readers write, without a new qualitative move in the democratization of the mass media. "Let the mass media become vital and more interesting, let there be real debate between people, not an artificial one, let the spark of new ideas and innovative decisions penetrate people's minds, and ultimately let people question high-level decisions if they have been made in haste and without sufficient thought. Our life and quite recent history suggest that such decisions were made and have yielded bitter fruit.

"A press which is completely and endlessly monitored and watched over even on trivial matters must essentially function as a transmitter or, in simpler terms, must express only the opinion of the upper echelons of power, and must sometimes fiercely defend not state or nationwide interests but the short-term opportunistic ambitions of leaders and their entourage." This opinion of Communist V. Kuybin, a staffer of the Ukrainian SSR MVD newspaper, is supported by other readers.

The editorial mail contains quite a few letters on the Communist's ethics, modesty, and principled nature. "The question of social justice and party modesty, we believe, must be discussed at the upcoming party conference." That is expressed in letters from L. Dubrovskiy and A. Korotkevich from Minsk and A. Travin from Dushanbe. Many people support the CPSU Central Committee Theses' provision on the social and political certification of Communists.

I would like to end this roundup with the letter from A. Filimonov, a worker from Severodonetsk. "I propose that it be settled once and for all that the party needs a radical restructuring, it needs a system of democracy that would totally preclude the abuse of power and the violation of the rule of law and the principles of socialism."

It is hard to disagree with that opinion. Restructuring in the country is only just beginning. There is a struggle of ideas in progress and not just of ideas. The old and outmoded offer stubborn resistance and use any method. Bureaucracy, with its age-old tricks and its unique adaptability to the changing conditions of life refuses to give way. We still have a real cleansing to carry out—it will be difficult and painful but it must be done.

History Exam Cancellation Causes, Implications

PM1006151588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 1

[I. Ovchinnikova article under the rubric "On Topical Issues": "The Examination Has Been Canceled, But History Goes On!"]

[Text] There will be no history or social science examinations at the country's schools. The very fact of the cancellation of these examinations does, of course, testify to a victory of common sense and plain conscientiousness: It is impossible to contemplate 17-year-olds drawing their examination questions and discoursing on, for instance, the year of the great breakthrough, or the Congress of Victors, as if they themselves and their parents have not experienced and are not experiencing right now the purging pangs of shedding the blinkers—or, more accurately, of being reborn.

The decision to cancel the examination was the only possible, sober, and honest decision to take. It reflects, probably more than anything else, the triumph of the new thinking and the readiness to discard ingrained

approaches. As recently as yesterday it was impossible to imagine that such a decision could be taken. Everyone—teachers, parents, and students alike—can only feel in this respect relief and gratitude toward those who had the courage to say "No" to such an examination. However, mingled with this feeling there is another—a feeling of profound shame.

Let us give it some thought, let us try to understand. The teachers who began their schooling after the 20th congress are now past 40. This means that they have been teaching children for 2 decades now. How was it possible that all these years, lesson after lesson, even the most inquisitive among them, even those who took the trouble to read, to learn, to search far beyond the scope of teaching regulations, were presenting the Fatherland's history in a dreadfully distorted form, distorted beyond recognition. Try to put yourself in the position of these people, guilty through no fault of their own; try to imagine what they feel when they open the newspapers and journals today and read the stinging lines and realize that they cannot, either today, or tomorow, or the day after teach children without themselves relearning.

The guilt of those who misled generation after generation, poisoning their hearts and minds with lies, is enormous; it is immeasurable. However, this guilt will have to be expiated by others. And it will have to be done quickly, literally within 2-3 months. In fact, summer will flash by, and it will be September again and pupils will return to school to learn and teachers to teach. To teach history and social science, among other subjects. And they will not be able to use the same books and textbooks which they are using today.

At the same time it is obvious that no one can write proper, lasting textbooks in the course of the 2 summer months. This means that emergency measures will have to be taken. This means that a call will have to go out to historians, social scientists, and economists who have already proven their independence of the deep-seated formulas, cliches, and concepts by their ferocious writings on current affairs. It is necessary to call on them to accomplish an act of civic courage and prepare a series of articles for students which could be published as pamphlets or in the periodical press.

There probably is also another solution—to prepare, as a matter of urgency, anthologies of already published documents with the necessary annotations. One thing is important: to publish as soon as possible textbooks which can be used to teach and to learn without going against one's conscience.

A history examination can be canceled, although that too is difficult and painful. But no one can cancel history itself. It goes on, and everyone who is alive today is taking part in its creation. We are reaping today the bitter fruits of our own readiness to compromise on moral issues; we are paying for the fact that we have allowed ourselves to be persuaded to remain passive and have consequently tacitly encouraged all that which embarrasses us today, at a loss for an answer to our own children's questions. Let us teach them in such a way as to ensure that when they become fathers they will not be embarrassed in front of our grandchildren.

Agricultural

Nikonov Visit to Kurgan Oblast Reported

LD1106022888 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 10 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Viktor Petrovich Nikonov is in Kurgan Oblast. Our correspondents report:

[Correspondent Yu. Balandin, identified by screen caption] In the first half of the day, Viktor Petrovich Nikonov visited the central market, where he inspected the organization of market trade and the work of the Druzhba retail and wholesale cooperative. [video shows Nikonov touring a covered market, with several men in attendance] Fresh vegetables and fruit are supplied mainly from the southern areas of the country. Prices for them remain high. There is not enough market garden produce in state greengrocer's shops. In conversations with customers and trade workers, acute problems were raised concerning food supplies to town-dwellers. [video shows Nikonov talking to a woman]

Viktor Petrovich Nikonov visited the the town dairy combine. The enterprise is operating following reconstruction. Yet the product range is, as Comrade Nikonov remarked, not characterized by variety. [video shows gateway with the sign "Kurgan Dairy Combine," building exterior, Nikonov inspecting a display of bottles of milk and other dairy products] In the new economic conditions, insufficient initiative is being shown in resolving production and social problems.

The Kurgan agricultural machinery production association, which was visited by Viktor Petrovich Nikonov, is the country's main supplier of equipment for livestock farms. [video shows Nikonov looking at equipment on display inside a factory] The State Acceptance Service, introduced a year ago, made high demands on the quality of the output. In a conversation with the association's staff, Viktor Petrovich Nikonov expressed the wish for more speed in the production of equipment for small livestock farms and for the individual milking of cattle.

In the second half of the day, there was a trip to the Kravchenko kokhoz in Pritobolnyy Rayon. [video shows Nikonov and others walking across a field] Here, Viktor Petrovich Nikonov inquired about the experience of introducing lease contracting. In the fields of the Kurgan Institute of Cereal Farming, Viktor Petrovich Nikonov

asked about current research into land cultivation, the introduction of crop rotation, and the use of fertilizers and ways of protecting plants and the environment.

Comparison of Nikonov in Yaroslavl

Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian on 22 May carries in its Second Edition, page 2, a TASS report on the Nikonov assessment of the performance of Yaroslavl Oblast. The SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA article, entitled "Reserves of the Yaroslavl Land," has been compared with the Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN version published in the 7 June Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pages 81-4, revealing the following variations:

Page 81

Column two, paragraph one, last line, the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA report reads: "...and feed production. Experience has been accumulated in selection work to breed highly productive strains of dairy cattle combining the best qualities of Holsteins with the local Yaroslavl breed. Here, however, it is noted that the efficiency of introductory work still lags behind the demands of the day.

"V.P. Nikonov visited...." (adding sentence)

Column two, paragraph two, last line, the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA report reads: "...kolkhozes and sovkhozes. An underestimation of their role is dulling peasants' proprietorial sense and lowering responsibility for observing technological demands in agriculture and livestock raising.

"At the Poshekhonskiy...." (adding sentence)

Page 84

Column two, paragraph four, last line, the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA report reads: "...the agro-industrial complex.

"A CPSU obkom plenum, in which V.P. Nikonov participated, took place in Yaroslavl that same day.

"The plenum participants elected delegates to the 19th All-Union Party Conference from those candidates put forward by the oblast's enterprise, organization, and kolkhoz and sovkhoz labor collectives." (adding paragraphs)

Goskomstat Reports on Sowing, Harvesting

LD1206015088 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0204 GMT 9 Jun 88

[Text] The USSR State Statistics Committee reports that sowing is being completed everywhere. On kolkhozes and sovkhozes, the seeds of spring crops have been sown on 127 million hectares. Crop tending and harvesting are under way. Many farms in the republics of Central Asia, Transcaucasia, and southern Kazakhstan have begun harvesting. The procurement of fodder is developing. The first million tonnes of hay and haylage have been stored.

Agricultural Developments for 6-10 Jun Noted

LD1206013888 [Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian, unless otherwise indicated, on 6-10 June. GMT times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item.

7 June

The harvesting of grain started in South Kazakhstan today. This year the acreage sown to cereal crops has been considerably reduced, but production of grain will not decrease. After all, one-fifth of the grain is being cultivated under intensive technology. The elimination of losses in harvesting will also make for an appreciable additional yield. Long before the start of the harvest, the combines uderwent a thorough check to see whether they were leakproof. Inspection of the working order and capacities of the means of transportation has been organized everywhere. (0500)

9 June

Tatarian land cultivators have completed the sowing of rape. It occupies 200,000 hectares here. The Tatraps financially autonomous scientific and production association has been set up to conclude agreements with farms so as to insure that they have seeds, fertilizers, and machinery. (Moscow Television 0552)

In Tselinograd Oblast, farmers have increased the plan for sowing of buckwheat by almost three times. The crop is being grow in 10 rayons instead of the planned 4. Overall buckwheat occupies twice as much land in the oblast as last year. Buckwheat is a good nectar provider and beekeeping is being intensified in the oblast. (1100)

In Krasnodar, the Krymskiy association has started processing green peas. This year Krasnodar Kray farmers will produce more than 150 milllion cans of peas. (1100)

Potato planting has ended in the Altay. Potatoes cover more than 20,000 hectares, which is a record. (1300)

Scientific

Officials Resign From Academy in 'Cadre Renewal'

LD1006175788 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1530 GMT 10 Jun 88

[Text] Half an hour ago, in the IZVESTIYA newspaper review, we reported briefly that a group of outstanding Soviet scientists, including academician secretaries of

departments and members of the presidium of the Academy of Sciences, have handed in a request to be released from their duties. Now we give more details about this story, unprecedented in the history of the Academy.

Sixteen of science's organizers have resigned at once. Comrade Semenov, head of the academy's personnel department, has emphasized that what is going on in the academy is the rejuvenation of cadres. The process of changing generations is regular and natural. Our first-string academicians have set an example of enormous significance. Their move is dictated by a desire to involve young and talented scientific organizers more actively in restructuring.

General meetings will be held before 20 June in the relevant departments to elect academician secretaries to the posts that have appeared. The first such meeting—in the general and technical chemistry department—has already taken place. Academician Fokin's job has been taken over by Comrade Nefedov, who was born in 1931. The elections are being held democratically, and several candidates are being put forward, instead of just the one. All of these are discussed in detail. The department secretaries, Academicians Bogolyubov, Markov, Kirilin, Fokin, Zhavoronkov, and Bayev, have applied to be transferred as advisers to the academy's presidium.

Of the members of the presidium, notices of resignation have been handed in by: Academician Aleksandrov (the former president of the Academy of Sciences); Academicians Amburtsyan, Vonsovskiy, Trofimuk, Svishchev, Piotrovskiy, (Starikovich), Tuchkevich, Fedorenko, and Shilo. They have also been appointed advisers to the presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Gratitude has been expressed to them for their outstanding services to science and for their active scientific and organizational work.

The cadre renewal in the academy will continue. At present 20 directors and 3 deputy directors of academic institute, as well as 160 heads of subsections [podrazdeleniye], hold their posts although they are of advanced years.

'Cosmos-1952' Satellite Launched 11 Jun

LD1306072688 Moscow TASS in English 0712 GMT 13 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 13 TASS—On June 11 the Soviet Union blasted off the satellite Cosmos-1952 with a Soyuz carrier rocket. Scientific equipment mounted aboard the satellite is designed to continue space explorations.

The satellite is put into orbit with the following parameters:

Initial period of revolution—89.4 minutes,
Apogee—300.2 km,
Perigee—215 km,
Orbit inclination—70 degrees.

The satellite also has systems for accurate measuring of the orbit's elements and transmission to the earth of data on operation of instruments and scientific equipment.

Equipment installed at the satellite operates smoothly.

Space Station Launchings, Experiments Announced

LD1106164688 Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 11 Jun 88

[Text] Soviet space vehicles will be used to carry out a big number of major international projects of exploring the universe. Deputy chairman of the Intercosmos Council under the USSR Academy of Sciences, (Gennadiy Kharitonov), said that two Soviet automatic space stations will be launched on the 7th and 12th of July. They will carry equipment made by Soviet scientists and also experts from 12 other countries and also the European Space Agency.

The purpose of the flight is to explore Mars and its satellite Phobos and also the sun and interplanetary space. It's also planned to launch the orbital observatories Gamma-1, Granat to study distant objects in the universe.

'Soyuz' Cosmonauts Join 'Mir' Colleagues 9 Jun

Gorbachev, Zhivkov Message

PM1006143388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jun 88 Secoond edition p 1

[M. Gorbachev and T. Zhivkov greetings message to Soviet-Bulgarian crew of the Mir orbital research complex; undated]

[Text] To Cosmonauts Titov, Manarov, Solovyev, Savinykh, and Aleksandrov, the international crew of the "Mir" orbital research complex

Dear Comrades!

We cordially greet and sincerely congratulate you on the successful start of your work on the "Mir" orbital research complex.

You have the honor of carrying out the second joint Soviet-Bulgarian space flight. The program for scientific research on the "Shipka" project which you are to carry out in orbit is a graphic example of the peaceful opening up of space. We are convinced that it will help the further development of scientific and technical progress in the interests of the economies of the Soviet Union and Bulgaria.

Your flight clearly demonstrates the everlasting and indestructible friendship between the Soviet and Bulgarian peoples, who are closely and fruitfully cooperating in all spheres of political, economic, and spiritual life and

implementing major revolutionary transformations in their countries at the modern phase of socialist building under the leadership of the CPSU and the BCP.

We express the conviction that you will justify this high trust with honor.

We wish you the successful fulfillment of the flight program and a safe return to earth.

M. Gorbachev T. Zhivkov

'Intensive' Research Program

LD1006144788 Moscow TASS in English 2130 GMT 9 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 9 TASS—Tonight the Soviet "Soyuz TM-5" spacecraft docked with the "Mir" orbital complex on an endurance flight. The international Soviet-Bulgarian citizen, Researcher-Cosmonaut Aleksandur Aleksandrov who went aloft in their "Soyuz" Tuesday evening, as well as the crew of the main expedition—Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov working in the "Mir" complex for almost half a year, will now operate as a single research team.

This is a highly professional team of researchers, purposeful and well trained for the mission. Aleksandur Aleksandrov, for one, defended his candidate of sciences thesis in 1983 at the Moscow Institute of Space Research and worked as deputy director of a kindred research centre in Bulgaria.

The crew is to handle a big workload of research. Not a single international expedition within the framework of the "Intercosmos" program has yet handled a program so intensive and so packed with experiments. This is the opinion of experts about the current Soviet-Bulgarian space flight which is to take ten days. About 50 experiments are planned within its framework. The program for scientific research was worked out by hundreds of scientists and engineers of the USSR and Bulgaria during a year.

The Bulgarian side manufactured nine instruments. These are state-of-the art instruments ensuring a comfortable man-machine dialogue. Specialists also praise the "Rojen" astronomical complex intended for the study of stars, galaxies and nebulae from on-board the "Mir" orbital complex.

It is also hoped that certain complex materials with small specific weight will be obtained in space. Specialists are also interested to see crystallization processes in zero gravitation.

An important place is alloted to remote sensing of the earth's surface in the interests of national economy of Bulgaria.

Flight Progress Described

LD1006161388 Moscow TASS in English 1425 GMT 10 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 10 TASS—A TASS correspondent reporting from Mission Control Centre:

The international crew comprising Vladimir Titov, Musa Manarov, Anatoliy Solovev, Viktor Savinykh (all of the USSR) and Aleksandur Aleksandrov (Bulgaria) have been working in orbit for two days.

The research programme to be conducted aboard the orbital complex Mir, which stands for "peace" in Russian, comprises numerous studies and experiments. Today, the crew are to conduct astrophysical and geophysical studies, medical, technological and biotechnological experiments.

The Soviet-Bulgarian crew will be busy with space astronomy studies with the use of the astrophysical complex Rozhen. Today, the cosmonauts will calibrate and adjust the equipment. The Serpent-Bearer and Swan constellations have been chosen for that purpose as model sources of irradiation.

The day programme provides for a series of photography and spectrometry sessions to study Bulgarian territory, measurement of the atmosphere's optical properties and the technological experiment Kliment-Rubidiy using the installation Kristallizator.

In addition to Soviet-Bulgarian studies, the crew of the Mir station will today begin a biotechnological experiment in keeping with an understanding reached between the USSR and Australia.

The aim of the experiment is to produce monocrystals of the influenza virus antigen in zero gravity for subsequent studies of their structure and properties.

Individual equipment in the transport ships was replaced today, as Solovev, Savinykh and Aleksandrov will return to earth in Soyuz TM-4.

According to telemetry data and crew reports, the flight is proceeding normally.

The visiting crew underwent a medical check-up with the view to studying peculiarities of the organism's adaptation to weightlessness.

All the cosmonauts are feeling fine.

Complaints About Equipment

LD1106055488 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1700 GMT on 10 June, as part of its "Vremya" newscast, carries a report by Correspondent S. Slipchenko on the activities of the cosmonauts aboard the Mir station. Cosmonauts Savinykh and Titov

are shown at work. One of the main tasks of this mission is remote sounding of Bulgarian territory to search for minerals. Looking out of a porthole, Savinykh complains that there is too much cloud cover. Some surveying was carried out, however, through gaps in the clouds. Slipchenko continues: "There also was an unpleasant conversation with the spacemen today":

[Titov, shown holding a bundle of belts] "Look, they have sent us up these rubber belts that cannot be attachd to anything anywhere; they have no clasps. This is the kind we asked for, with hooks, clasps. [video shows Titov holding up a belt with a clasp on one end] They can be attached to things [video shows Titov demonstrating the clasps]. But what is the use of these? [video shows Titov picking up the bundle of new belts] What are we supposed to do with them?"

[Slipchenko] "Commenting on this scene, Musa Manarov said that they ought to (?sort out this mismanagement everywhere. The items up there) really do have to be perfect. The cosmonauts and staff of the Flight Control Center used to feel rather shy about discussing this subject, but given such an intensive schedule and the open way problems are addressed today, there are changes in the demands being made and the conversations between earth and space. The crew have given a guarantee that the schedule will be completely carried out in spite of everything."

Program Success Cited

LD1106204788 Moscow TASS in English 1154 GMT 11 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 11 TASS—TASS correspondent reporting from the Mission Control Centre:

The working day of the Soviet-Bulgarian crew on board the complex Mir started at 9 o'clock Moscow time and will last till midnight.

Under the programme of geophysical research, the cosmonauts will carry out today a series of "Georesurs" experiments (geological resources). The aim is to take pictures of separate regions of the earth, probe into the optical characteristics of the atmosphere and register its contamination by different components. The experiments involve a stationary camera, Kate-140, hand-held cameras and Spectre-256 equipment.

Research continues into transatmospheric astronomy with the use of the astrophysical complex, "Rozhen". Constellations Pegasus, Sagittarius and Ophiuchus were selected for observations. The "Rozhen" equipment includes an optical-electronic converter with a receiver, a computer to process the results of measurements and automatically control the experiment, as well as a system of information registration.

One more experiment in space materials science will be carried out today to develo technology for obtaining unique materials with high t nic conduction:

A series of biotechnological experiments is held on "Ainur" and "Ruchei" (Stream) plants as part of the Soviet research programme on board the complex. The first one is intended for isolating the monocrystals of protein preparations in conditions of zero-gravity for further research into their spatial structure and properties. The second experiment involves electrophoretic cleaning of genetically engineered Interferon.

A satellite link-up was set up late on June 10 between Sofia and the complex Mir. During the televised session Todor Zhivkov, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, chairman of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, wished the international crew successful implementation of the mission programme.

According to the results of medical check-up, Vladimir Titov, Musa Manarov, Anatoliy Solovev, Viktor Savinykh and Aleksandr Aleksandrov feel well.

The programme of the joint mission is being fulfilled successfully.

Sleep Experiment Noted

LD1206054388 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0400 GMT 12 Jun 88

[Text] The Flight Control Center reports that today the crew of the Mir manned complex will have a routine working day. Scheduled operations according to the plan of a medical experiment called Sleep [son] will be conducted. The goal of that experiment is to analyze the quality of sleep in conditions of weightlessness. The cosmonauts will continue the survey of Bulgarian territory and its coastal Black Sea waters within the framework of the Georesurs program. Also scheduled are studies of the properties of earth's atmosphere.

Crew's Fourth Day Reported

LD1206124988 Moscow TASS in English 1130 GMT 12 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 12 TASS—TASS correspondent reporting from the Mission Control Centre:

Anatoliy Solovev, Viktor Savinykh and Aleksandr Aleksandrov are spending their fourth day on board the orbital complex Mir conducting research together with Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov.

The cosmonauts are carrying out research into physical processes in the ionosphere and the upper layers of the atmosphere with the help of the optical-electronic spectrophotometer designed by Bulgarian specialists.

One of the areas covered by the Soviet-Bulgarian research programme concerns the study of processes of adapting human organism to the conditions of space flight. To this end, the visiting crew conducts a series of medical experiments to study the cosmonauts' capacity for work, to evaluate the efficiency of measures aimed at preventing the negative impact of zero-gravity.

Geophysical experiments feature prominently on the programme. Today the cosmonauts will take pictures and use spectrometre to take measurements of the territory of the People's Republic of Bulgaria. Information they will receive will be used to solve many scientific and economic problems, including geology and control of the contamination of the atmosphere and littoral water areas. Research will continue into the development of higher plants in conditions of space flight.

The flight of the orbital complex Mir is proceeding normally. All cosmonauts feel well and are in a good mood.